

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.
A. D. GODLEY, Hon.D.Litt., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management.

PROF. E. & CONWAY, Litt.D., F.R.S., Chairman.

PROF. J. F. DONSON, M.A., Hon. Treasurer.

PROF. A. G. CLARK, Litt.D., F.R.S., Hon. Secretary.

PROF. SILBERT MURRAY,
LL.D., D.Litt., F.R.S., F.R.S.L.
PROF. C. PLAMSTAD
WALTERS, M.A.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

OSYR BAILEY, M.A., Representing the Oxford Philological Society.
PROF. SIR WILLIAM BIDEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.R.S., Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Sir W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., Montreal; Prof. T. C. TUCKER, LL.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXIV NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1920 Nos. 7, 8

CONTENTS

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS:

	PAGE
The Hyporcheme of Praeneste, H. W. GARNOD	129
The Hyperboreans again, Abaris, and Helixia, GRACE H. MACCABY	137
Orientation of the Dead in Greece and Italy, H. J. ROSE	141
Terentians (Continued from C.R. XXXII. 93 and XXXIII.), J. S. PHILLIMORE	147
Notes and Suggestions: A. Athenassa, B. Horace, C. Plautus, T. G. TUCKER	152
When did Agricola become Governor of Britain? J. G. C. ANDERSON	158
De Nihilo, A. E. HOUSMAN	161

NOTES:

Appian, <i>Civil Wars</i> , I. Ch. 14, M. CARY	164
Hero and Leander, T. W. LOMB	165
<i>Amstel</i> XI. 309, J. W. M.	166
Alapari, W. M. LINDSAY	167
Punctuation of Livy XXVII. S. M. M. FERRIES	167
On the Latin Pentameter, A. PLATT	168

REVIEWS:

Allen and Flickinger on the Greek Theatre, G. C. RICHARDS	169
---	-----

REVIEWS—continued

	PAGE
Origin and Meaning of Apple Calis, H. J. ROSE	172
Seneca, J. WIGHT DUFF	173
Martial, J. WIGHT DUFF	176
An Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic, W. W. HOW	178

SHORT NOTICES:

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, W. H. D. R.	179
Euclid in Greek: Book I, W. H. D. R.	180
Aristophanes and the War Party, R. B. A.	180
<i>Études sur la Signification et la Place de la Physique dans la Philosophie de Platon</i> , R. G. BURY	180
Literary Recreations and More Literary Recreations, R. B. APPLETON	181
Epicuro: Opere, frammenti, testimonianze sulla sua vita, R. G. BURY	182

NOTES AND NEWS

NOTES AND NEWS	182
----------------------	-----

CORRESPONDENCE

CORRESPONDENCE	183
----------------------	-----

BOOKS RECEIVED

BOOKS RECEIVED	183
----------------------	-----

INDEX

INDEX	185
-------------	-----

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. 6d. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free.

The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

19 BLOOMSBURY SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1

President: PROFESSOR J. G. REID, D.Litt.

THE Society embraces the history, art, and archaeology of Rome, Italy, and the Roman Empire, down to about A.D. 700.

In connexion with the Hellenic Society, the Roman Society maintains a joint library of Greek and Roman art, archaeology and history, and a collection of lantern slides and photographs. Members may borrow books and slides, and these can be sent through the post.

Communications respecting books and slides should be made to the Librarian.

Afternoon meetings for the reading and discussion of papers are held at Burlington House, W. Notices of these are sent to all members.

Life membership composition for persons over fifty years of age ten guineas, for others fifteen guineas. Annual subscription one guinea. There is at present no entrance fee.

Persons desirous of joining the Society should communicate with the Secretary.

THE JOURNAL OF ROMAN STUDIES (11 x 7½ inches) is published by the Society in half-yearly parts, and sent post free to all members.

The papers in Vols. I-V include articles by English, American, French, and other foreign scholars, and amongst others:

ANDERSON, J. G. C. The Quinquennium Neronis.
ASHLEY, Dr. THOS. (of Rome). Recent Excavations at Ostia.

ASHLEY, Dr. THOS. (of Rome). Roman Malta.

BARKER, Miss B. R. The Catacombs of St. Callixtus.

BONI, Camandottore. Recent Discoveries on the Palatine at Rome.

BRYCE, Viscount. Religion in the Roman Empire.

CAGNIAT, Prof. (of Paris). A Roman Customs List.

CALDER, Prof. W. M. Roman Amphitheatres in Asia Minor.

CAZZA, GUIDO (of Rome). Roman Art at Ostia.

CUMONT, Prof. (of Belgium), and ANDERSON, J. G. C. Three New Inscriptions.

DESSAU, Prof. British Censures.

DOMASZEWSKI, Prof. The Magnus Mater.

DOUGLAS, Miss. Juno Sospita.

ESDAILE, Mrs. A. Statues in the Palatine Barberini.

HAVERFIELD, Prof. Roman Chests of Eastern Britain.

HAVERFIELD, Prof. Roman London.

HAVERFIELD, Prof. and H. STUART-JONES. Romano-British Art.

MACDONALD, G. The Corbridge Gold Coins.

REINACH, SALOMON (Prof.). A Roman Statuette of Zeus.

REID, Prof. J. G. Roman Public Law.

REID, Prof. J. G. Human Sacrifices at Rome.

STRONG, Mrs. B. A. The Archaeological Exhibition of 1911 at Rome.

WARDE POWELL, W. The original meaning of the word "Sever".

WARREN-SOWLER, W. Mundus Patet.

Vol. VI (delayed by the War) is in active preparation in the press.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Librarians). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. E. Norman Gardiner, 2, The College, Epsom; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Professor Pearson, Etonfield, King's Gap, Hoylake, Cheshire, and Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss Hilda Livesey, 155, Oswald Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Miss Margaret Hooker, Secondary School for Girls, Erdington, Birmingham; Mr. H. A. Ormerod, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss Wilkinson, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. Strudwick, City of London School for Girls, Carmelite Street, E.C.4; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss M. L. Newman, 7, College Street, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; and Professor Dawson, Northcote House, Apollo Bandar, Bombay.

Φ
το
το
κο
ξε
κο
έρ

5

10

11

C
C
C
C
X
κ
δ
S

t
s
a
C
L
e
i
t
t
t

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1920

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE HYPORCHEME OF PRATINAS.

ATHENAEUS 617b, 8: Πρατίνας δὲ ὁ Φλιάσιος, αὐλητῶν καὶ χορευτῶν κατεχόντων τὰς ὀρχήστρας, ἀγανακτεῖν τινας ἐπὶ τῷ τοῖς αὐλητὰς μὴ ξυναυλεῖν τοῖς χοροῖς, καθάπερ ἦν πάτριον, ἀλλὰ τοὺς χοροὺς ξυνάδειν τοῖς αὐληταῖς. ὃν οὖν εἶχε θυμὸν κατὰ τῶν ταῦτα ποιούντων ὁ Πρατίνας ἐμφανίζει διὰ τοῦδε τοῦ ὑπορχήματος.

τίς ὁ θόρυβος ὅδε; τί τὰδε τὰ χορεύματα;
τίς ὕβρις ἐμολεν ἐπὶ Διονυσιάδα πολυπάταγα θυμέ-
λαν;
ἐμὸς ἐμὸς ὁ Βρόμος· ἐμὲ δὲ κελαδεῖν, ἐμὲ δὲ
παταγεῖν,
ἀν' ὅρεα σύμενον μετὰ Ναιάδων,
5 ἅτε κύκνον ἄγοντα ποικιλόπτερον μέλος.
τῶν αἰοιδῶν κατέστασε Πίερης <ὅπα>
βασιλειαν· ὁ δ' αὐλὸς ὑστερον χορευέτω·
καὶ γὰρ ἐσθ' ὑπηρέτας.
κῶμῳ μόνον θυραμάχοις
10 τε πυγμαχίαις νέων θέλει παροῖνον
ἔμμεναι στρατηλάτας.
παῖε τὸν φρονίου ποικίλου πνοῖαν
χέοντα, φλέγε τὸν ὀλεσισίαιον κάλαμον λαλο-
βαρύσπα παραμελορυθοβάταν
ῥυπαρο>τρυπάνως δέμας πεπλασμένον
15 ἡνιδού· ἅδε σοι δεξία καὶ ποδὸς
διαριφά. θριαμβοδιόραμβε.
κισσόχαϊ· ἀναξ, ἀκουε τῶν ἐμῶν Δωρίων χορείαν.
5. ἅτε scripsi: διὰ τε codd. 6. τῶν αἰοιδῶν
Casaubon: τῶν αἰοιδῶν codd.: <ὅπα> addidi, metri
causa. 10. θέα el(s) codd., corr. Dobree: παῖε
codd., corr. Jacobs: φρονίου Emperius: φρονάϊου
codd. 12-13. πνοῖαν dedi (πνοῖαν iam Emperius):
χέοντα Jacobs: προνέχοντα codd. 13. ὀλεσισίαιον
κάλαμον dedi (ὀλεσισιαλοκάλαμον iam Emperius):
ὀλοσιαλοκάλαμοι codd. 14. ῥυπαρο>τρυπάνως
scripsi: θυπατρυνάμῳ codd.

I will preface what I have to say upon this Fragment by a brief account of the sources of our knowledge of Pratinas: a subject inadequately treated in books of common access. The name of Pratinas does not occur in literature earlier than the second century of our era. No writer mentions Pratinas who is not further removed from him in time than I am from Chaucer. His name occurs for the first time in the treatise *De Musica*, commonly ascribed to Plutarch. 'Plutarch' speaks —

strangely to our ears—of 'Pindar and Dionysius of Thebes and Lamprus and Pratinas and the other lyrists who excelled in musical composition (ποιηταὶ κρουμάτων ἀγαθοί),' (1146 B). He associates Pratinas always with the theory of music and with the hyporcheme (1133, 1142, 1134: cf. Plut. *Symp.* IX. 2). Of the Pratinas who has chiefly interested modern scholarship, the Pratinas who wrote tragic and satyric dramas, the Pratinas who contended for fame with Aeschylus, he knows nothing. The first writer to connect Pratinas with drama is Pausanias (perhaps fifty to a hundred years later). But Pausanias' knowledge of Pratinas is just so much as he picked up one day in the streets of Pratinas' native town, Phlius. In Phlius there was a tradition that Pratinas had written reputable satyric plays. But even to the loyal Phliasians he was, it would seem, a less notable poet than his son Aristias, who had a statue in the market-place. τούτῳ τῷ 'Αριστίᾳ σάτυροι καὶ Πρατίνα τῷ πατρί εἰσι πεποιημένοι πλὴν τῶν Δισχύλου δοκιμώτατοι, says Pausanias — oddly rendered by Mr. A. R. Shilleto: 'The satyrs carved by Aristias and Pratinas are reckoned the best carving after that of Aeschylus.' But I am not clear that Pausanias knew much more about Pratinas than Mr. Shilleto. If we go on another half-century, we find Pratinas mentioned several times by Athenaeus. If the diligent reader will look at Meineke's Index, s.v. *Pratinas* he will find that, in all the passages there cited by Meineke, the Pratinas spoken of by Athenaeus is, like the Pratinas of 'Plutarch,' a lyrist, a hyporchematist, a *musicus*. In not one of these passages is there any hint of Pratinas the dramatist.

However, Meineke's Index is here defective; for it omits a passage in Book I. (22a), where Athenaeus speaks of 'Thespis Pratinas Carcinus and Phrynichus.' Heaven forbid that I should speak ill of Athenaeus, a solace of my declining years. Yet I half suspect that he does not know that this Pratinas of 22a is the same person as the Pratinas of whom he speaks elsewhere. Why I say this will be apparent presently.

Apart from these writers, who is there in antiquity who has anything to tell us of Pratinas? I know no one for certain. But then I am not certain when antiquity ends and the Middle Age takes on. However, let us call 'ancient' the Hypothesis to the *Septem c. Thebas* of Aeschylus, and be grateful to it for this: *ἐνίκα Λαίῳ Οιδίποδι Ἑπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας Σφηγὶ σατυρικῇ. Β' Ἀριστίας Περσεὶ Ταντάλῳ <Ἀνταίῳ> Πάλαισταῖς τοῖς Πρατίνου πατρός.* (I have added <Ἀνταίῳ> after Ταντάλῳ, since, obviously, four plays are required. The *Antacus* of Aristias is mentioned by Herodian, *Mon. Lex.* p. 916, Lentz. If the supplement I suggest is plausible, we shall no longer suppose, with Gaisford and others, that all three plays mentioned in the MS. text were posthumous plays of Pratinas. The *Palaestae* alone will belong to Pratinas. How easily <Ἀνταίῳ> might be lost after Ταντάλῳ I need not say).

By the side of this Aeschylean scrap I will place 'Acron' upon Horace, *A.P.* 216 ('Acron' perhaps belongs to the fourth or fifth century):

satyrica dramata, in quibus salva maiestate gravitatis (? tragicæ artis) iocos inserebant secundum Pratinæ (Cratini *codd.*: *corr. Casaubon*) institutionem: is enim primus Athenis, dum Dionysia essent, satyricam fabulam induxit.

Cratini is the most obvious blunder for *Pratine*, as anyone will know who knows what the letters *C* and *P* look like in rustic capitals. Yet Casaubon's correction is not so much as mentioned in the Apparatus to the 'standard' text of 'Acron.'

This at any rate, so far as my knowledge goes, exhausts 'antiquity'; and all else that we know of Pratinas we owe to Suidas.

And now I will essay a piece of scientific 'Ueberlieferungsgeschichte' — if such things are not by now altogether out of court.

Somewhere towards the beginning of the third century B.C. a pupil of Aristotle, the famous Aristoxenus, wrote a work of (presumably) popular character to which he gave the name 'Mixed Drinking Questions' (Σύμμικτα Συμποτικά). But even in his lighter hours Aristoxenus could not keep off the theory of music; and in a portion of this work he traced the development of the lyric from the earliest times down to the time of Timotheus. This work was used in common by 'Plutarch' and Athenaeus. Athenaeus, in the book (xiv.) in which he has preserved to us the Hyporcheme of Pratinas, eleven times names Aristoxenus; and at 632a he definitely mentions the Σύμμικτα Συμποτικά. 'Plutarch' mentions Aristoxenus at 1134 F, 1136 C, 1136 D, 1143 B, 1146 F; and in the last of these passages he, in effect, names the Σύμμικτα Συμποτικά: συνέβαινε γὰρ εἰσάγεσθαι μουσικὴν ὡς ἱκανὴν ἀντισπᾶν καὶ πραινέειν τὴν τοῦ οἴνου ὑπόθεσιν δυνάμει, καθάπερ πού φησι καὶ ὁ ὁμέτερος Ἀριστόξενος, κ.τ.λ. But what above all makes certain the dependence of both writers upon Aristoxenus is that to both of them, as I have said, Pratinas is primarily, indeed exclusively, a lyrist and musician. Pratinas the dramatist is, it is true, mentioned at Athenaeus 22a. There Athenaeus draws upon a different source, and fails, I have suggested, to identify the two Pratinases. The different source—whether Athenaeus draws upon it directly or indirectly—is another pupil of Aristotle, Chamaeleon (Athen. 21e 13; 22a 10). Chamaeleon wrote a work *Περὶ Σατύρων*: and this book¹ was probably a principal source of information in later times upon the subject of the primitive drama (see Suidas *sub ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον*). Chamaeleon and the Aristotelian *Didascalie* may be supposed to have supplied to Alexandria most of what was known there of Pratinas the dramatist. (To this, perhaps by way of the *Onomatalogos* of

¹ With the same writer's *Περὶ Θέσπιδας* (Suidas *sub οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον*).

Hesychius, the Lexicon of Suidas goes back.) That Alexandria had anything, or *knew* very much, of Pratinas is perhaps not probable. Dioscorides' Epitaph for Sositheus, *A.P.* vii. 707, 3-4,

ἐκισσοφόρησε γὰρ ὦνῆρ
ἀξια Φλειασίων ναὶ μὰ χοροῦς Σατύρων.

says little, and is all that there is that is relevant.

The memory of Pratinas, then, survived, as of a lyrist and musician in Aristoxenus, as of a dramatist in Chamaeleon. But the two traditions (the second very thin) never meet and mingle. The extant Fragments of Pratinas we owe, one and all, either to 'Plutarch' or to Athenaeus. They are waifs from the *lyric* tradition, the flotsam and jetsam of the sea of books (there were more than 450 of them) with which Aristoxenus besieged the shores of ancient learning. All inference is hazardous, all reconstruction builds in, and on, sand. None the less, in what concerns Pratinas, the reconstruction 'Plutarch' + Athenaeus = Aristoxenus, Σύμμικτα Συμποτικά appears to me to be better founded than most of the inferences upon which we act and talk in matters a good deal more vital to our peace of mind. And I propose, therefore, to consider the words with which Athenaeus introduces us to the Hyporcheme of Pratinas in close connexion with a passage of 'Plutarch' which appears to be pretty certainly derived from the same source.

What does Athenaeus mean by the words αὐλητῶν καὶ χορευτῶν μισθοφόρων κατεχόντων τὰς ὀρχήστρας? Mr. Weir Smyth (*Greek Melic Poets*, p. 341) translates: 'When some hired flute-players and choreutae were occupying the orchestra'; and I daresay this is the commonly received rendering (the Latin versions of Dalecampius and Natalis Comes throw no light on the clause). The words appear to me to mean something quite different. I take them to refer, not to some specific occasion, but to a general period in the history of lyric ἀγῶνες in Athens. What I mean will appear at once if we place beside them 'Plutarch' *De Musica*, ch. 30, 1141 C-D: τὸ γὰρ παλαιόν, ἕως εἰς Μελανιππίδην τὸν τῶν διθυράμβων ποιητὴν συμβεβήκει τοὺς αὐλητὰς παρὰ

τῶν ποιητῶν λαμβάνειν τοὺς μισθοὺς, πρωταγωνιστοῦσιν δὴλον ὅτι τῆς ποιήσεως τῶν δ' αὐλητῶν ὑπηρετούντων τοῖς διδασκάλοις. It will be noticed at once that the last five words look very much like an echo of lines 7-8 of our Pratinas poem (ὁ δ' αὐλὸς ὕστερον χορεύετω· καὶ γὰρ ἐσθ' ὑπηρετὰς). Now let us look again at our sentence of Athenaeus: which, in the light of 'Plutarch,' I would render (freely) thus: 'In the period when the orchestras (generally, and not some particular orchestra on some particular fine day) were (beginning to be) usurped by flute-players and choreutae who were hired (not by the poet, but by some one else — i.e. the choregus).' 'Plutarch,' it will be observed, says nothing about choreutae. He merely says that until the time of Melanippides flute-players were paid by the poet. Herein I take it he is more faithful than Athenaeus to their common text of Aristoxenus. I am told by those who know that the choregia in Athens was instituted, for lyric contests at the Great Dionysia, not long after 507, and for tragic contests something near thirty years earlier (*Marm. Par.*, epp. 43, 46: see Haigh, *Attic Theatre*³, pp. 9, 11). Whether the responsibilities of the choregi at these early dates extended to the payment of the auletae as well as of the choreutae, I have no idea. But, taking only what is common to 'Plutarch' and Athenaeus, leaving aside, that is, Athenaeus' choreutae, it seems likely that Aristoxenus—unless both his copyists have misinterpreted him—affirmed somewhere in the Σύμμικτα Συμποτικά that the auletae were not engaged by the choregus until a very much later date. Aristoxenus may very well, for all I know, have been wrong; and the matter is one beyond my province. I recall, indeed, that Aristotle (*Politics* 1341a 30) tells us that a date which may be taken as roughly 470-460 (the commonly received *floruit* of Ecphantides) the use of the flute was so much in vogue among free Athenians that a certain Thrasippus, who was the choregus of Ecphantides, himself acted as auletes. But it is, of course, true that the organisation of Comedy lagged behind that of Tragedy (and dithyramb): Arist. *Poet.* 1449b init.

MM. Weil and Reinach, who have edited the *De Musica* in a manner which is at times, I think, a little arbitrary, boldly excise from Plutarch's text the words *ἕως εἰς Μελανιππίδην τὸν τῶν διθυράμβων ποιητὴν*—though they have no note upon the difficulty to which I refer. In any case, I feel no call to adjust the limbs of literature to the bed of history in this Procrustean fashion. The date of Melanippides (*i.e.* Melanippides II.—though I regard Melanippides I. as a figment of the brain, if he had one, of Suidas), the date of Melanippides has to be determined in the light of two statements of Suidas: the one, that Melanippides ended his days at the court of Perdiccas (454-414?), the other that he was the junior of Diagoras (Suidas s.vv. *Διαγόρας* and *Μελανιππίδης*). The *floruit* of Diagoras is given by Eusebius, *Chr.*, against the year 468—possibly, as Wilamowitz-Moellendorff suggests, the date of the Epinicion for Nicodorus of Mantinea. (Upon the difficult problem of the chronology of the life of Diagoras, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Textgesch. d. Griech. Lyriker*, pp. 81, ff.) Melanippides and Diagoras were fellow-countrymen, the joint heads of that school of innovating Melian lyric in which Aristoxenus appears to have been especially interested (Philodemus, *Περὶ Ἐῦδος* 85, Gomperz; Bergk, *P.L.G.* iii. 562). They would be thought of as a pair; and though the former may have been, as Suidas says, junior, 'the time of Melanippides' need not mean anything very different from 'the *floruit* of Diagoras.'

This leaves the question of the method of engaging flute-players where it was; but it gives us a date—Aristoxenus' date—for the Hyporcheme of Pratinas. It belongs to the very last years of Pratinas' life. It is his dying protest against a corruption of lyrical style which began with Lasus, which was to be continued by Melanippides and completed by Philoxenus and Timotheus. So at least Aristoxenus conceives the development, in the outline of metrical history which Plutarch summarises in *chh.* 29-30: *Ἀλσος δ' ὁ Ἑρμιοεὺς εἰς τὴν διθυραμβικὴν ἀγωγὴν μεταστήσας τοὺς ῥυθμούς καὶ τῇ τῶν αὐλῶν ποίῳ*

φωνία κατακολούθησας πλείοσι τε φθόγγοις καὶ διερριμμένοις χρησάμενος εἰς μετάθεσιν τὴν προπάρχουσαν ἤγαγε τὴν μουσικὴν.

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Μελανιππίδης ὁ μελοποιὸς ἐπιγεγόμενος οὐκ ἐνέμεινε τῇ προπάρχουσῃ μουσικῇ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Φιλόξενος οὐδὲ Τιμόθεος.

The Hyporcheme of Pratinas was chiefly interesting to Aristoxenus, Plutarch, and Athenaeus as a document of the history of metre and music. It is, therefore, an odd irony that the poem should be offered to us, in the current texts, in a form which seems expressly designed to conceal both the rhythm and the symmetry of the piece. My first care has been to rearrange the lines in such a way as to exhibit anew what has been thus concealed. The first six lines in Bergk, Hiller-Crusius, Farnell, Weir Smyth, are properly divided. But thereafter chaos reigns, and the lineation employed makes nonsense of the metre. I will begin, therefore, by trying to explain the metrical constitution of the poem.

It falls naturally into four parts: 1-5; 6-11; 12-14; 15-17. In order that no one should miss the effect of this quadripartite division, Pratinas was careful to indicate the demarcations by employing at each point where they occur a cretic dimeter. The cretic and fourth paeon are the characteristic rhythms of the hyporcheme (Simonides, 29, 31; Bacch. *Fr.* xi-xii, Jebb; Georg. Choerob, p. 218, Schol. B. *Heph.* p. 303, Consbruch); and the cretic dimeters at 6, 12, 15 stare one in the face. Yet no editor has discovered them. (I have added <ὄπα> at the end of 6 for the sake of both sense and metre, but otherwise I have not altered a letter of the vulgate, beyond writing *πνοιάν* for Emperius' *πνοάν* in 12—giving a catalectic dimeter.) Lines 1-4 are anapaestic (dimeter, trimeter, trimeter, dimeter): 'nunc anapaesticum numerum agnosce,' says Bergk in his last edition—he had previously called the verses paeonic. But neither Bergk nor anyone else has recognised the anapaestic tetrameter in 13. Of these anapaests I shall have something further to say presently. The conjunction of cretic and anapaestic rhythms is, of course, perfectly normal. Lines 5, 7,

and 10 exemplify the verse known to the ancients as the hyporchematic prosodiac: and where would one expect to find this species of verse if not in a hyporcheme? Yet from the current texts of the Hyporcheme of Pratinas all three of these hyporchematic prosodiams have been ruthlessly and ignorantly expelled. (10 represents the exact form of the verse as given in Plotius: 5 and 7 depart from this only in so far as they replace the initial Aeolic anapaest by the Ionic form, and are acatalectic.) Line 17, again, is the verse technically known as the hyporchematic pentameter; and, once again, where should we look for this verse if not in a hyporcheme? But in the Hyporcheme of Pratinas, as edited by the best editors, you will look for it long and vainly. Yet I have not 'emended'—I have merely used my ears. Lines 8 and 9 I have divided into trochaic dimeter + iambic dimeter. That they should together constitute a trochaic tetrameter (which, as a matter of longs and shorts, they do) no one will suppose who knows how trochaic tetrameters should be written. The trochaic dimeter recurs at 11. Line 14 is a trochaic trimeter (or, more properly, hexapody), 16 an iambic trimeter—with catalexis in each case.

But when the ancient metricians talk of hyporchematic rhythms, and when Athenaeus calls this poem a hyporcheme, what do they, in fact, mean? Of the character of the hyporcheme, it cannot be too often said that we know practically nothing. Most of what is relevant to the subject is conveniently set out in Mr. Weir Smyth's *Greek Melic Poets*, pp. lxi ff. But, as may be seen there, we depend in the main upon Lucian and Athenaeus. The hyporcheme is mentioned, I think, but once in Greek literature prior to the Graeco-Roman period. Plato, in the *Ion* (534 c) speaks of 'dithyrambs, encomia, hyporchemes, ope, iambs.' But save for this passage of Plato there is, so far as I know, no reference anywhere to the hyporcheme until Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Adm. V. Dic. Dem.* 7 and 43, *ad fin.* R. 972, 1093), who, however, adds to our knowledge merely nothing. What we are told by later writers must be accepted

always with the reservation that they were familiar with the late-Alexandrian hyporcheme (the parent of the pantomime). When Athenaeus tells us that the hyporchematic dance has affinity with the cordax of Comedy (630 e), that is probably true of the hyporcheme of his own day. That it was true of some species of hyporcheme in the classical period is possible, but not confirmed. That it was true of hyporcheme as a separate species of lyric performance (as opposed to hyporchemes occurring in drama) there is nothing to suggest. Of persons who wrote this kind of hyporcheme in any period of which we have knowledge (by which I exclude the early Spartan school), the only recorded names are Pindar, Pratinas, and Bacchylides. When Mr. Weir Smyth says that 'the genius of the hyporcheme reached its highest excellence with Simonides' (p. lxxv) he is merely building a romance round a long exploded misinterpretation of Plutarch, *Symp.* ix. 2. On the other hand, there is evidence, as I have just indicated, that the hyporcheme had its place in drama. Tragedy, at least, had its hyporchemes (Schol. Soph. *Phil.* 391; Schol. Eur. *El.* 885; Tzetzes, *De Trag. Poes.* 1, 58; 2, 115). So, I believe, had the satyric drama. I have little doubt that our Hyporcheme of Pratinas is, in fact, a fragment of a satyric drama. It was cited, no doubt, by Aristoxenus as occurring *ἐν ὑπορχήματι*—i.e., in a hyporchematic Chorus in a satyric play—and Athenaeus faithfully reproduces the *ἐν ὑπορχήματι* of his original, conceiving the importance of Pratinas, as does Plutarch also, to be solely that of a lyrist and musician. The interest of the piece to Aristoxenus was solely that of a document in the history of music. That it was a fragment of a drama was something not relevant, and upon which he was silent, misleading his copyists.

For look at the piece without prepossessions. Did Pindar and Bacchylides write hyporchemes of this sort? There pervades it, to my mind, the very breath of Comedy. If you interpolated it into a play of Aristophanes, would anyone find it out of place? Or if you found it in the *Cyclops* of Euripides would you cry out upon its dissonance

with the satyric spirit? Certainly—so at least I feel—it is nearer to Aristophanes than to the *Cyclops*: if we knew more of the early satyric drama that would perhaps not surprise us.

Let us look at the piece a little more in detail. I will not ask, 'What is Bromius doing in the Apolline hyporcheme?' For, just as all dithyrambs were not about Dionysus, so it may well be that all hyporchemes were not about Apollo. Bromius may possibly be as much in place in hyporcheme as Athena Itonia in dithyramb (Bacchyl. Fr. 11, Jebb). That the author indulges a turn for literary and metrical criticism proves very little as to the species of poem. Mr. Weir Smyth thinks that such criticism was perhaps a characteristic of hyporcheme, citing—among a number of other passages which I cannot trace—'Simonides' 29 and 31 (which, however, few persons besides himself would assign, now, to Simonides: some critics even give these fragments to Pratinas, as others to Pindar). The fact seems to be that these excursions into literary criticism characterise a good many—perhaps most—species of lyric: e.g. dithyramb (Pindar Fr. 79, Christ) and nome (Timotheus, *Pers.* 226 ff.): compare, from *Adela* the Pindar Fr. Ox. Pap. 408 b (Schroeder 140 b) and Timotheus Fr. 12.

The fragment is, upon the face of it, at least quasi-dramatic. It may, of course, be said that there is no reason why we should disallow this dramatic element in hyporcheme and allow it in the literary dithyramb—as Bacchyl. xvii. (xviii.). But what in our Fragment is the dramatic situation? Can we believe—for to this editors have been reduced—that the Chorus of Pratinas broke in upon the performance of a hired troupe of choreutae belonging to Lasus, or some friend of Lasus, and in a vigorous *autoschediasma* gave them to understand what they thought of their singing and of their style generally—ἐμφανίζει ὃν εἶχε θυμὸν περὶ τῶν ταῦτα ποιούντων? The only suggested alternative (on the Hyporcheme hypothesis) is that the Chorus of Pratinas, instead of singing a hyporcheme in the style of Pratinas, sing one that is a parody of the style of Lasus. Think of

Pindar, or Bacchylides, composing this sort of Hyporcheme! Does not such a theory in effect concede that the poem is not a hyporcheme at all, in the sense in which such poems were understood by the only poets certainly known to have composed them (outside drama)? For the two alternatives—and never a third—the reader may consult Mr. Weir Smyth's note, p. 342.

As I conceive the situation, we have a satyric drama in which, at the point where our Fragment takes on, some one (the protagonistes?) has just brought to an end a lyric strain easily apprehended by the audience as a parody of the 'New Rhythmic.' (The element of parody suggests forcibly the Old Comedy.) Upon the dying cadences of this strain the Chorus bursts in tumultuously, and deluges the protagonistes with invective bordering—to my mind; but we shall see—upon ribaldry. It seems to be commonly assumed that the opening lines of the piece, with their 'resolved' anapaests, are themselves intended to parody the Lasian style. This I take to be a complete misapprehension. It is true that these resolved anapaests, which the ancients sometimes called proceleumatic verse, appear in the line of Timotheus' *Odyssey* (?*Cyclops*) cited in *Etym. M.* 630, 40 (Bergk 7); and that, for Aristoxenus, Timotheus completed what Lasus began. It is probably true also that Philoxenus employed this type of verse (I infer this from Mar. Vict., p. 98, 22, K). On the other hand, not only are these resolved anapaests characteristic of Comedy (Mar. Vict. 98, 27, K. cf. Gaisford, *Heph.* ii., pp. 106 ff. Christ, *Gr. Metr.*², p. 342); but, what is much more to the point, they were especially characteristic of the satyric drama: 'hoc metro veteres satyricos choros modulabantur, quod Graeci εἰσὸδιον¹ ab ingressu chori satyrici appellabant, metrumque ipsum εἰσὸδιον dixerunt' (Mar. Vict. p. 99, 19 sq., K.). In other words we have here the 'Entrance Measure' which characterised the Parodos (apparently called, in satyric drama, Eisosdos) of the satyric

¹ Qu. quos Graeci εἰσὸδια?

Chorus. Our Pratinas Fragment belongs to the opening scene of the play from which Aristoxenus derived it.

I have said that the element of parody reminds one forcibly of the Old Comedy. This is even more true of the vigorous and sudden personal attack—for I think nothing else can be intended—in line 13. Pratinas contrasts the inflation of the 'mottled toad' with the 'bright-winged carol of the swan.' The 'mottled toad' is *someone*. But who? Clearly *φρυνίου* is *paraprosdocian* for *βατράχου*. But the surprise fails of point unless, in *φρυνίου*, the audience at once recognise a personal name. Is *φρυνίου* one and the same with *Φρυνίχου*? Etymologically, yes. And I think really. The suggestion is an old one, as old, certainly, as Dalecampius. But it has been allowed to drop out of memory. I confess, it seems to me a most probable conjecture. The only misgiving I feel in connexion with it being that the last recorded victory of Phrynichus falls in the year 476, some eight years earlier than the date we have been led to assume for this piece. That Phrynichus was a pupil of Lasus, we have no evidence. But, in that era, who was not?

Lasus (and Phrynichus) care too much for the flute and too little for the words. The offending flute is described as a 'spittle-wasting, chatter-bellowing, out-of-tune-prancing reed.' Is that the diction of Pindar and Bacchylides? Or does it not carry us straight into the world of Aristophanes? There follows a line which, if I have rightly restored the words, or if (quite apart from my attempted verbal restoration) the sense which I am going to give to the line is its proper sense, must, I think, determine for good and all in favour of a satyric drama and against an independent 'hyporcheme.' From the MS. *θυπατρυπάνω δέμας πεπλασμένον* I have extracted *ρύπαροτρυπάνως δέμας πεπλασμένον*. Of the text of the current editions (*ὑπαί τρυπάνω κ.τ.λ.*) I can make nothing. Is there point, or even sense, in speaking of a reed, or flute, as 'fashioned in respect to its form (or body, or 'build') beneath an auger'? (*sub veretro fictum* Natalis de Comitibus). Or are we to take *ὑπαί*

τρυπάνω with *φλέγε*—'burn beneath a brazier-fire'? I would suggest a quite different explanation of the perplexing *δέμας*. Unless I am mistaken, *δέμας* is a word of the Old Comedy—indeed, very much so. It is found in Plato Comicus 173, 10, Kock, in a citation from Philoxenus. It is adequately explained, in connexion with that passage, by Eustathius 1283, 31 ff., who tells us that it was used by *οἱ σεμνότεροι* as a synonym for *ψωλή*. Compare Hesychius: *δέμας · σχοινίον*: and for this sense of *σχοινίον* see Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1342, and Athenaeus 621 b 5 (where the true reading is pretty certainly *σχοινίζεται*). *κάλαμος* (13) and *σχοίνος* are, of course, in certain contexts interchangeable. The flute, then, suggests to Pratinas the broadly humorous image of *ἑκτασις τοῦ αἰδοῦν*. Such is the licence of the primitive hyporcheme—in satyric drama. A flute *ρύπαροτρυπάνως πεπλασμένον* is one affected by *παραπλάσμός*. The word *παραπλάσμός* is explained by Hesychius, s. v., as *ὁ ἐν ταῖς τῶν αὐλῶν τρυπαῖς ῥύπος*.

The rest of the text requires very little interpretation. But I will complete what I have said by notes upon one or two small points.

5. *ἄγοντα . . . μέλος* seems at least to be the source of Hesychius' *ἄγω · μέλω · ἄδω*. But the expression is a strange one. (More natural would be *κινῶντα*, as Ap. Rhod. iv. 1299, *κύκνοι κινήσουσιν ἑὸν μέλος*). Casaubon's rather obvious *ἄδοντα* destroys the metre; which may be why Bergk claims it as his own conjecture. Schweighauser compares *ἄγειν χορόν*—after Casaubon had been at pains to point out that the two phrases were dissimilar. 'Simonides' 29, 3 has *καμπύλον μέλος διώκων*, where, however, the expression has to be compared with *φόρμυγγα διώκων* in Pindar, *Nem.* v. 24 (cf. *διώκειν πόδα*, etc.).

'*ποικιλόπτερον* goes with *μέλος*, not with *κύκνος*,' says Mr. Weir Smyth: 'Songs have wings.' The fact is that in this case wings have songs; that is to say, the Greeks supposed the music of *cycnus musicus* to proceed, not from his bill, but from the action of the wind in his pinions. Hence *Hymn.*

Hom. xxi. 1. κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων λίγ' αἰεῖδαι. *Anacreontea*, 58, 7 (Bergk):

ἄτε τις κύκνος καθστῶν
ποικίλον πτεροῖσι μέλπων
ἀνέμῳ ξύναυλος ἦχῃ.

Append. *Anacr.* i. 22 (Bergk):

ὁ καλὸς γέρον ὁ κύκνος
Ζεφύρον πνέοντος ἔγνω
λιγυρὸν μέλος τι μέλπειν.

The elk, or singing swan, was known to the Greeks apart from the dirge (Plato, *Phaed.* 85); nor does even Aristotle *Hist. An.* 615, b 2 appear to suppose that the swan sings *only* at the point of death (ᾠδικοὶ δέ, καὶ περὶ τὰς τελευτὰς μάλιστα ᾄδουσιν). Aristotle *l.c.* is incorporated verbatim in Athenaeus 393 d, who adds that Alexander the Myndian attended the deaths of many swans, but never met a swan that sang. Therein he earned the sympathy of Lucian, who journeyed to the Eridanus and back to hear the swans sing, but was much mocked by the fisher-folk there, who had never heard a swan do more than crow like a rather debilitated cock: κρῶζουσι . . . παντ ἄμουσον καὶ ἀσθενές (Lucian, *De El.* ad fin.).

10-11. κῶμος, θυραμάχοις, παροίνων suggest the technical names of specific coystiril songs: κῶμος, ἡδύκωμος, κρουσίθυρος, θυροκοπικός, παροίνιος.

12. The MS. παῖε can surely not be defended by Arist. *Vesp.* 456, παῖε τοὺς σφήκας ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας, cited by Bergk and Mr. Weir Smyth (there ἀπὸ makes all the difference); still less by the analogy of the sportsman's 'beaters.' Yet more idle is the citation of Paus. i. 24, where παίονσα does not mean *abigens*.

13. I have written χέοντα with Jacobs, instead of Emperius' ἔχοντα, on account of Simon. 148, 8, πνεῦμα χέων καθαροῖς ἐν αὐλοῖς. Compare Telestes, 2.

16. Why should L. and S. render διαρριφά by 'a scattering'? It means a throwing up of the leg; and I take the diction to be that of Comedy. 'By δεξία is indicated the rapid chasing of the fingers on the stops of the de-tested flute' (Weir Smyth). Surely

the reference is to the χειρονομία of the dancer?

17. ἄκουε . . . χορείαν 'properly metonymy' (Weir Smyth). No: the ancients included *song* under χορεία: e.g., Plato, *Legg.* 454b 3. Δῶριος with out 'motion' seems to be technical with ἁρμονία, etc., right down to the latest period: Arist. *Pol.* 1276b 9; Athen. 625a 4, al. Pratinas approved above all the aeolic harmony (which was also known as the hypo-dorian: Athen. *l.c.*).

I will end by offering here two textual conjectures which connect, at any rate, with Plutarch, *De Musica*, and with the development of the lyric art, and may thus far be considered relevant.

(1) In Suidas' biographical notice of Lasus it is said of that corrupter of musical style that διθύραμβον εἰς ἀγῶνα εἰσήγαγεν; and in works of reference he seems to be commonly credited with having introduced dithyrambic contests at Athens in the last years of the sixth century. Plutarch, however, *De Mus.* 1141 B, speaks of Lasus as εἰς τὴν διθύραμβικὴν ἀγωγὴν μεταστήσας τοὺς ῥυθμούς. It seems to me, accordingly, more than probable that what Suidas wrote was διθύραμβώδεις ἀγωγὰς εἰσήγαγεν.

(2) Plutarch, *op. cit.* 1135 C ad. init.: προτερά μὲν γὰρ ἡ Τερπάνδρον καινοτομία καλὸν τινα τρόπον εἰς τὴν μουσικὴν εἰσήγαγε. Πολύμνηστος δὲ μετὰ τὸν Τερπάνδρειον τρόπον, καινῷ ἐχρήσατο, καὶ αὐτὸς μέντοι ἐχόμενος τοῦ καλοῦ τύπου, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ Θαλήτας καὶ Σακάδας· καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι κατὰ γε τὰς ῥυθμοποιίας ἱκανοὶ, οὐκ ἐκβαίνοντες μὲν τοῦ καλοῦ τύπου.

4. καινῷ Westphal: καὶ ᾧ codd.

Westphal's καινῷ must, I think, be right. But the last lines stand in need of correction. Did Plutarch write κατὰ γε τὰς ῥυθμοποιίας ἐκαίνου, οὐκ ἐκβαίνοντες μὴν?

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College,
Oxford.

THE HYPERBOREANS AGAIN, ABARIS, AND HELIXOIA.

MISS HARRISON made a just criticism on my paper on the Hyperboreans, published in the *Classical Review* for 1916, in her review of the year's work in Greek religion and mythology¹ for 1917. I quote the passage in question: 'But to the making of the Hyperborean myth went another bora, sheltering another garden of the Sun, Φοῖβον παλαιὸς κήπος, which I would ask Professor Macurdy to consider. Pauly-Wissowa's lexicon has happily embarked on a second series beginning with R, and concealed under Πίπαια ὄρη is an account of the astronomical Heiliger Götterberg im Norden, behind which the Sun, after setting in the west, was supposed to pass to the east. This astronomical and of course purely imaginative northern bora puts a new complexion on many an old confusion, on the myths not only of Hyperboreans, but of Kimmerians and Atlas. The bora of myth gets contaminated with the bora of fact, like contamination of hero and daimon.'

I heartily concur with all that Miss Harrison says about the heavenly Bora. Kiessling's remarkable article was known to me at the time when I wrote my paper, and I refer to his remarks about the derivation of the word Hyperborean. My own aim was merely to show that the myth of the Hyperboreans was among the gifts of the Pierians to Greece, and to bring the previously suggested derivation of the word from bora, mountain, into connexion with the well-known facts about the northern worship of Sun and Moon, Apollo and Artemis Basileia in the Hyperborean countries² Illyria, Thrace, Macedon, and Thessaly. I had no intention of giving these mythical people any local habitation except possibly that assigned them by Minns: 'The Hyperboreans are always the people beyond knowledge toward the north. They must always figure as the last term in any series that stretches in that

direction.' My surprise was great on reading Mr. Casson's recent article³ on the Hyperboreans to find him stating that I had placed the Hyperboreans themselves among the people of Pelagonia-Paeonia, among whom, as I argue, the myth about them arose. I derive the name from the Pierian side, but did not mean that the Hyperboreans were neighbours close by the Paeonians. By my expressions 'the land beyond the bora,' and 'a holy race of men living beyond the bora on the north-western track that led to the home of the Sun God,' I meant an indefinite region of fancy. Professor Shewan's remarks in *Class. Quart.* XIII. 2, 66-67, on the idealisation of unknown regions, give many illustrations of such imaginings about people just beyond the limits of knowledge. My dwelling on Heracleia Lyncestis as an important station in the route of those who came from the north for purposes of trade or cult was intended to emphasise the significance of the entire Sun-route, along which the Sun and Moon, Apollo and Artemis Basileia, were worshipped by Illyrians and Thraco-Paeonians. Somewhere in the track of the Sun, ἀμφὶ Ἀελίου κνεφαίαν ἱππόστασιν, there lived, in the Thraco-Greek imaginings of them, a blessed folk, devoted to the service of Apollo. From them, Ἰστρου ἀπὸ σκιερᾶν παγῶν, Heracles, according to Pindar's famous passage, brought the olive, Τπερβορέων πείσαισ' Ἀπόλλωνος θεραπόντα. And though the Heavenly Pair, from whose cult, according to my belief, the myth arose, was worshipped all along the trade-route which led to the (fancied) home of the Hyperboreans, yet ναυσὶ οὔτε πεζὸς ἰὼν τάχ' εὔροις ἐς Τπερβορέων ἀγῶνα θανμαστόν ὁδόν. I regret that my interest was so centred on the etymology of the word, and the transmission of the myth to Southern Greece by the Pierians, that I did not make sufficiently clear the fact that I did not place them in any definite region beyond the Bora. Between the Pelagonians and the ancient Chinese, whom

¹ 'Year's Work in Classical Studies,' 1917, 96.

² Farnell, *Cults*, IV. 100 and 104.

³ *Class. Rev.* XXXIV. 1 and 2, 1ff.

Mr. Casson, following Gladisch afar off, inclines to, I personally would choose Pelagonians, on the principles laid down by Professor Shewan in the pages already cited. The Pelagonians, like the wild peoples discussed by Professor Shewan, were called Titans and giants.¹

And Almopia on the Bora and Pallene are among the giant-lands. J. N. Svoronos has an interesting, though highly rationalistic, explanation of the way in which the Titans came to be called Pelagones in his article in the *Journal International Numismatique* for 1913, entitled 'Numismatique de la Péonie et de la Macédoine.' As Phere-nikos says² that the Hyperboreans were sprung from the blood of Titans, one might, if so inclined, make a genealogy from that. I am not arguing for that, however, but for the general thesis that the Danubian peoples influenced, to a greater extent than is usually admitted, the religion and mythology of Greece. M. Svoronos puts the case perhaps too strongly when he says—'que la Péonie greque et le Pangée . . . deviendront dans l'avenir le plus important centre et point de départ des nos connaissances numismatiques, historiques, et mythologiques.' The article on the 'Date of Hesiod,' by T. W. Allen (*J.H.S.* 35) shows clearly the influence of the southern Thracians on Greece proper; and Tomaschek, in his well-known articles on 'Die Alten Thraker,' discusses the culture of these more civilised of the northern tribes and their contacts with Greece.³ These 'mountaineers, descending either in one flood or in various streams from the Haliacmon,' brought with them a form of music, an art of healing, and many myths connected with their local worships. In the article just cited Mr. T. W. Allen writes: 'By Hesiod's time the *Πιέpes*, southern Thracians—to Homer a mere landmark like Emathia between Olympus and Athos—had sent their muses, friends of Thamyris, southward.' And by Hesiod's time, too, as Mr. Allen does not fail to note, the myth of the Hyperboreans had reached the south.

My own position is that the cult of

the Sun and Moon in the 'Hyperborean' lands, Illyria, Thrace (in the widest sense of Thrace), Macedon, and Thessaly, produced the Hyperborean legend; that it took shape in the lands this side the Bora, and that Bora is Bermion in particular, or the Balkan range in general. But I do not mean by this that the people who imagined the Hyperboreans were the Hyperboreans.

Now to take up Mr. Casson's view. He thinks that the 'main problem at issue' is to 'locate' the pre-Hellenic or non-Hellenic Hyperboreans. In his endeavour to do this he follows Gladisch and Tomaschek, though without repeating all of their puerilities. Of such attempts Daebritz⁴ remarks: '(Darum) hat man es im algemeinen aufgegeben die H. zu lokalisieren.' Gladisch, in his work on 'Hyperboereer und die alten Schinesen,' brings forward such things as the love of music in China and among the Hyperboreans. The Hyperborean griffins he derives from the dragons of the Chinese flag. Mr. Casson refers to the celestial calm of the Chinese as perhaps faintly echoed by the Hyperborean bliss. That and the griffins are mentioned by him as indicating an Asiatic home for the Hyperboreans. The celestial calm, the music, and the Chinese flag may be dismissed. The griffins offer ground for argument as to whether they came to the Hyperborean worship from the Apollo worship at Delos and Delphi, or vice-versa. Like the swans they are debateable, and both views have adherents. Daebritz condemns the method of Tomaschek and Gladisch: 'Es bedeutet doch ein Rückkehr zu dem Rationalismus der Alten.' The theories of both have been generally discredited by recent scholars, and rationalism has no doubt been carried by them to an absurd degree. Yet it is difficult to escape the charge of rationalism in the explanation of myth, and many who use the term in reproach are found guilty of it. Atlantis, the Phaeacians, and Elysium itself, had a 'rationalistic' element in their origin, and my own theory of the Hyperboreans is open to that charge, as I connect

¹ Strabo 7, *frag.* 30, Callim. *Hymn to Zeus* 3.

² Schol. on Pindar *Ol.* 3, 28.

³ *J.H.S.*, 1914, p. 95.

⁴ Pauly-Wissowa, 121, 122, Sp. 279.

them with a highway of trade and religion. The Chinese resemblances seem particularly vague and meaningless, and Professor Shewan's articles tend, I think, to show that such legends are apt to arise, so to speak, a little nearer home—that is, about places 'just beyond knowledge.'

It can neither be proved or disproved that the word Hyperborean is, as Mr. Casson suggests, a corruption of a real name of a Chinese or Asiatic tribe. It has, in that case, 'gone very wrong indeed,' and it surely came to mean to the Greeks, 'Those living behind the North Wind.' Before that I believe it meant, 'Living beyond Bora,' on the Hyperborean Road. As for Bora or Sabora in Spain, the evidence for its existence is, I believe, entirely numismatic, and I have not been able to examine it as yet. In any case I cannot believe that its rose-gardens played as large a part in Greek legend as those of Paconia. Sappho's lines are significant:

οὐ γὰρ πεδέχεται ῥόδων
τῶν ἐκ Περσίας.

With Mr. Casson's treatment of the legends of Abaris I am utterly in disagreement, and here also I should be inclined to hurl that dangerous and so often recoiling epithet 'rationalistic.' Why should Mr. Casson derive from Ovid, *Met. V.* 86, the information that the Abaris of the legends came from the Caucasus? He could as well call him a Rutulian from the occurrence of the name in an epic battle in Virgil,¹ or a Dolionian from a similar episode in Valerius Flaccus.² As Haupt remarks on the passage in Ovid, these adjectives are only a device to give vividness to the epic narrative. In no one of the three passages is there any reason to suppose that the legendary Greek Scythian or Scythian Greek is the warrior in question. Mr. Casson considers Abaris a Greek traveller, contemporary with Aristaeas. It is far more probable that he was a Sun-priest, and ἀνθρωποδαίμων, like Zalmoxis and Orpheus, in connexion with whom his name appears. He is master of the

ἐποδὴ as they are.³ Suidas ascribes to him χρησμούς and καθαρμούς. His magic arrow and his purity of life are the most striking points in the legend, and these may well bring him into connexion with the Thracian Sun-worship, which produced Orpheus. A wonderful picture of him is given by Himerius,⁴ Ἀβαριν δὲ τὸν σοφὸν γένος μὲν Ὑπερβόρειον λέγουσι, Ἕλληνα δὲ τὴν φωνὴν γεγενῆσθαι, καὶ Σκύθην μὲν ἄχρι στολῆς καὶ σχήματος. His speech was perfect as of the Academy or Lyceum. With his bow and arrows, his chlamys, his gold girdle and his trousers he was the perfect Scythian to look upon, in manners and morals the perfect Greek ideal of the fourth century A.D. sophist. Zalmoxis was also transformed into a follower οὐ τῷ ἀσθεειστάτῳ σοφιστῇ, Pythagoras, according to information given to Herodotus by some Pontic Greeks.

The name of Abaris has been regarded as Thracian, and is explained by Crusius⁵ as perhaps connoting his function in the Hyperborean rite. It is rather curious that in the three battles, in Ovid, Valerius Flaccus, and in Virgil, where a hero of this name is killed, names elsewhere associated with Thrace are in the neighbourhood—Rhoetus in both Valerius Flaccus and Virgil, and Phineus in Ovid. His father's name is given as Seuthes by Suidas. The Doliones of Valerius Flaccus are Thracian in origin. Mr. Casson's conclusion, that the whole story of the Hyperboreans originated at a time when the scientific study of ethnology was developing, and that the story was because of its vagueness relegated to the realm of myth and religion, is unpsychological and ignores the facts. As Jacoby⁶ says, Hecataeus of Abdera 'hat, der Forderung der Zeit entsprechend, dieses Volk aus der Unbestimmtheit in eine feste geographische Umgebung gebracht.' The course of the myth actually has been from the poetic fancy of the early period to the exact statements of the Euhemeristic

³ Plato, *Charmides*, 158; Euripides, *Cyclops*, 646.

⁴ Him. *or.* 25.

⁵ Roscher i. 2, 2831.

⁶ Pauly-Wissowa, 7. 2756.

¹ *Aen.* IX. 354.

² III. 152.

period. Hecataeus did not hesitate to state that the land or island of the Hyperboreans still existed in his time, which was that of Alexander the Great and the first Ptolemy. He says that many Greeks had visited the island and left precious gifts with Greek inscriptions. The place described by him so definitely and yet so romantically has often been identified with England.

As for the Karambukai, a name which appears to Mr. Casson to be of an eastern type, there is more to hold it to the Black Sea and European Scythia and 'Celtica.' Pliny¹ mentions a Carambucis river in connexion with the Celtic promontory Lytharmis. The passage is as follows: 'ab extremo aquilone ad initium orientis aestivi Scythae sunt. extra eos ultraque aquilonie initia Hyperboreos aliqui posuere, pluribus in Europa dictos, Primum inde noscitur promonturium Celticae Lytharmis, fluvius Carambucis.' This is evidently the part of the world where Celtica and Scythia meet. Compare Strabo 7: *ἐν δὲ τῷ παντὶ κύκλῳ τῆς οἰκουμένης πρὸς ἄρκτον τῶν ὑστάτων ἐστὶ τῆς Σκυθίας ἢ τῆς Κελτικῆς*. Diodorus² also tells of an island of the sea near the ocean, *τῆς Σκυθίας ὑπὲρ Γαλατίας*. Cf. also Pliny's island Baunonia³ in the North Sea, over against Scythia.

There is a promontory in Paphlagonia, often mentioned, Carambis, and for the last part of the word there is the river Buces,⁴ which flows into the Maiotis, identified by Tomaschek as the Nogaika. For the meaning of Buces see Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 17.

In speaking of the tradition which identified the Hyperboreans with extra-Scythic tribes of the Far East of the ancient world, Mr. Casson remarks that Hecataeus of Abdera appears to have travelled in the very regions where this tradition places the Hyperboreans. He then writes: 'Hecataeus mentions an island called Helixioia, and its inhabitants the *Καραμβύκαι*.' I do not know whether I am justified in inferring from this that the writer of it supposes Hecataeus to have visited Helixioia.

The island is described, though not named, in the citations from Hecataeus found in Diodorus 2. 47. In this well-known passage the island is said to be as large as Sicily, *ἐν τοῖς ἀντιπέρας τῆς Κελτικῆς τόποις κατὰ τὸν Ὠκεανόν*. Diodorus also quotes Hecataeus and others as saying that the island *ὑπάρχειν κατὰ τὰς ἄρκτους*. Moreover, the Moon is at a very little distance from the island, and earth-hills on it can be very clearly seen.

I wish to propose a derivation for the name of the island, which seems to me so obvious that I cannot believe that it has not been suggested before. However, I have not seen it. To make my point clear I will first quote from Kiessling's article on the Rhipaean Mountains a part of his discussion of arctic and antarctic poles. 'Wenn die Geographen dazu kamen, die Rhipaen auf den Polarkreis der Erdkugel zu zu lokalisieren, so muss ihnen dieser einmal für den Bärenkreis gegolten haben. Auch Aristoteles konnte die Lage unten der Bärin nur auf die Deklinationssparallele des grossen Bären und die dadurch bestimmte geographische Breite beziehen. Aber für Herakleitos und die ionischen Meteorologen lag das astronomische Nordgebirge unter der Projection des Bärengestirns auf die Erdscheibe. Hinter dem Gebirge war darum der Bezirk der Bärin den die Sonne unkreist um vom Untergang zum Aufgang zurückzukehren, cum relaturus diem septentrionum accesserit confinia, sagt Avien. ora marit. 649f.'

In the Hellenistic period the name Helice was given to both the Great and the Little Bear. The name is very frequent among later writers. The word evidently has to do with *ἐλιξ* and *ἐλίσσω*. Both of these words are used of the movements of the Sun and the stars. The verb is used in the *Iliad* for turning the horses of the chariot around the *τέρμα*. The name Helixioia of the island *κατὰ τὰς ἄρκτους*, which constellations in this period had the name Helice, might have been invented for the place where the Sun turns his steed around this northern *τέρμα*.⁵ Heracleitus

¹ *N.H.* 6. 34.

² Diodorus V. 23. ³ *N.H.* 4. 94.

⁴ Pauly-Wissowa *Πάπαια ὄρη*, 888.

⁵ According to Pherecydes (ap. Athenaeum 11. 38) the Sun descends with his chariot *εἰς τὸ χρῆσειον θέτας ὃ αὐτὸν ἐφέρει σὺν ταῖς ἡπτοῖς*.

speaks of the Bear as the *τέρμα* of Dawn and Dark. *ἡοῦς καὶ ἑσπερίης τέρματα ἄρκτος*. It may be that the name Helice for the Bear constellations had the same origin, though various others are offered.

I think that Mr. Casson is decidedly on the wrong track in seeking the Hyperboreans so far east as China. Rather in the place of which Virgil speaks:

*mundus, ut ad Scythiam Rhipaeasque arduus
arces
consurgit.*

Even this is, in Kiessling's words, to look at the myth of the Hyperboreans with the eye of the geographer. But that is just the contamination of the earthly Bora with the heavenly of which Miss Harrison speaks.

I believe that it is true that these

Hyperboreans, folk behind the mountain, were, in the more naïve time of peasant fancy, thought of as nearer than in the time of geographical and astronomical knowledge. As fanciful at first as the inhabitants of a haunted forest or lake they were shifted farther and farther away as geographical knowledge increased.¹

I am sorry that my previous article lent itself to any misunderstanding of my views. I had no intention of giving my Hyperboreans any fixed home as long as they stayed in the realms of myth. After that, when they got into the hands of the geographers, they were pushed up *ὑπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἄρκτον*.

GRACE H. MACURDY.

Vassar College.

¹ How and Wells, *Herodotus*, 4. 34.

ORIENTATION OF THE DEAD IN GREECE AND ITALY.¹

THERE is a curious passage in Plutarch (*Solon* 10), on which no adequate commentary exists. When Solon and the Athenians had got possession of Salamis, there ensued a long and exhausting war with Megara, which was at last settled by Spartan arbitration. The common tradition is that Solon had a proof-text from Homer, of his own forging, to win his case with; 'but the Athenians' own version is that this is nonsense,' and they claim that Solon produced historical proof of a deed of gift from the children of Aias to the Athenian state, and further appealed to the testimony of archaeology, whereby it was made plain 'that the dead (in Salamis) were laid out, not in the Megarian, but in the Athenian fashion. Now the Megarians when they bury a man turn his face to the east, but the Athenians to the west.' He is careful, however, to add the counter-opinion of Hereas of Megara (early third century B.C., see Pauly-Wissowa s.v.), that the real difference is not as the Athenians would have it, for the Megarians also bury their dead with

a westward aspect (*πρὸς ἑσπέραν τετραμμένα*), but that the Athenians bury but one in a grave, the Megarians as many as three or four.

So far as the Athenian orientation goes, Aelian supports this account, both he and Plutarch I suppose drawing at first hand or otherwise upon an *Atthis*; for he says (*var. hist.* V. 14) that it is a law of Athens that he who finds a dead body shall by no means omit to cast earth upon it, and further that he should bury it face to the west. But Diogenes Laertius introduces great confusion into the matter in his *Life of Solon* (I. 48) by telling the story, it would seem from the same source as Plutarch, or one very like it, with this curious variant, that Solon found not only the dead men in the graves of Salamis, but the graves themselves, 'looking to the east' (*πρὸς ἑω βλέποντας*). The witnesses for the westward position in Athens are two to one; but while I have no high opinion of the intelligence or critical powers of the worthy Diogenes, I cannot hold with C. F. Hermann (*Lehrbuch der gr. Ant.*,¹ II. iii. 40, p. 205) that he so grossly mistook his own language as to suppose that 'to turn towards the

¹ The following paper was read before the Classical Association at Newcastle, April, 1920.

west' or any other quarter meant anything but to have one's face and eyes in that direction—*i.e.*, in the case of a man buried in the extended position familiar in classical times and in our own graveyards, to have the feet pointing that way. That howler was reserved for German Kultur, and K. O. Müller (*Dorier* II. p. 401), and in our own days H. Blümer, in his revision of Hermann's book (3rd edition, p. 397), seem to imagine that to turn towards a place is to point the top of one's head at it. I imagine that in the account Diogenes read he was told that Solon's excavations extended to the Megarid as well as Salamis, and that in the former place he found tombs with their doors pointing east and the dead with their feet to the door; and that in his notebook the passage got confusedly copied. Pausanias attests a westward position for Elis, for he tells us (V. 13. 2) that the *temenos* of Pelops, which was wrongly supposed to be a burial-place, was entered from that quarter.

But what are we to say to the dictum of a scholar who knows more of archaeology than Plutarch and Pausanias combined? Orsi (*Mon. Ant.* I. col. 773) says of the cemetery of Megara Hyblaea, a colony, it will be remembered, of Megara proper (Thuc. VI. 4. 1.), with graves containing inhumations and cremation (the former are about four times as numerous as the latter) of all dates from almost the beginnings of Sikeliote history onwards—that it gives no evidence of any sort of orientation whatsoever; 'i cadaveri venivano distesi casualamente senza norme di sorta,' and adds that wide observations elsewhere give the same result. In the first place, we may point out that he partly contradicts himself, for he tells us that 'for the most part the tombs were oriented from east to west, but others, and not a few, ran north-south' (col. 750). This is true of Greek temples, which no one would say are without orientation, and of Christian churches, which are supposed to follow the rule stated by Durandus (p. 14 in Neale and Webb, *Symbolism of Churches*,³ cf. p. 165 ff.)—namely, that the altar should be to the east, for a variety of interesting mystic reasons. But it

remains true that a great many tombs in this and many other cemeteries, Greek and Roman, cannot be coaxed into reference to any particular point of the compass by any amount of special pleading. Shall we hold then that, as Hereas was demonstrably wrong when he said that the Athenians buried one in a grave only, the Megarians several, the truth being that family vaults, so to call them, are common in Attica as elsewhere (Hermann-Blümer, *l.c.*), so also he was quite wrong about the practice even of his own day in his own land, and that the Athenians had no clear tradition about the arguments used by one of their most notable men on an unforgettable occasion? I think not, if we do but consider a little what orientation really means, what ideas it is connected with, and how it is modified by circumstances.

To begin with, the word is unsatisfactory, and I use it only because it is traditional and I can think of nothing better. I mean by it the arrangement of anything, often a building, in the present case a dead body in the grave, on a funeral pyre, etc., in such a way that the front of the building, or the face of the corpse, shall be turned in a given direction. When that direction is a point of the compass, or more or less definite region of the heavens, such as sunrise, the bearing of which is roughly the same from all points over a large area of the earth's surface, I propose to call this *celestial orientation*; but if the fixed point be something on the earth's surface, whose bearing therefore shifts rapidly as we move about, I would speak of *terrestrial orientation*. Thus the orientation of a Christian grave is celestial; the body lies extended on its back, feet east; whence the picturesque Welsh term for the east wind, *gwynt troed y meirw*, 'wind of the dead men's feet;' but a Muslim grave has terrestrial orientation; the body lies on its side, face towards Mecca, whether that city be north, south, east, or west from the place of interment.

But what does it all mean, and why should a grave face one way rather than another? Two theories have been propounded: that of the late Professor

Tylor, who saw in such practices a solar element (*Prim. Cult.*² II. pp. 48, 121); and the older explanation of Herbert Spencer (*Prin. Soc.*³ I. p. 201 ff.) that the dead were turned to face the original habitat of their people. The latter view, unlike most of the philosopher's rather hasty generalisations, has of late received strong support from detailed examination of a part of the facts. Mr. W. J. Perry, in a very able article in the *J.R.A.I.*, Vol. XLIV. (1914), pp. 281 ff., has shown that it will fit and explain the orientation of the graves in most of Indonesia, and also the orientation of such few statues as the inhabitants possess, and of the sacred 'men's houses' which form an important feature of their villages. Save for a few cases, where the intrusion of a sun-cult gives a reasonable explanation and in a limited way justifies Tylor's theory, graves, statues if any, and men's houses, all face towards the region from which the people in question either actually came or think they came, as their traditions show. In one particularly interesting case, that of the Olo Ngadjoe of South-Eastern Borneo, the dead are laid parallel to the river on whose banks the tribe live, and it is their express belief that they go up-stream to a sacred mountain, which is historically the district from whence they came; for in most cases the old homeland to which the dead are to go is identified with Hades—a condition of things which in no way prevents living men from using the country, unmolested by the ghosts of a foreign tribe, it would seem (cf. G. Landtman in *Festschrift tillegnad E. Westermarck*, p. 68).

Certain investigations upon which I have recently embarked lead me to the provisional conclusion that the ultimate origin of terrestrial orientation at least is no other than the love for the dead and desire for their return which I hold to be a strong factor in their cult and tendance. I do not seek to deny the force of all the mass of evidence which Sir J. G. Frazer has collected (*Belief in Immortality, passim*), concerning the fear of the dead and the means taken to drive them away; but that logically opposed beliefs can be simul-

taneously held is or should be a commonplace to all investigators of cult. What could be more unlike than Homer's Hades, where dwell the poor strengthless shadows which are all that the fire has spared, and the formidable ghost of Agamemnon, sending up from his tomb help and strength to Orestes and Elektra? Yet both beliefs and their supposed corresponding practices—cremation and inhumation—went on side by side in Greece, and much the same happened in Italy and in prehistoric Gaul. See especially Déchelette, *Manuel d'Archéologie*, I. p. 468 (cf. II. 603), for a much needed protest against the idea, which disfigures many otherwise excellent works, that such variety indicates difference of race, creed, or anything else: the Kiwai Papuans (Landtman, *op. cit.*) whose dead go a long journey through real places on the surface of the earth to a goodly land also on the surface, at the same time are quite ready to believe in an underground Hades and apparently in the dead living somehow in their graves. But there is not even a formal inconsistency in the belief now under discussion. The dead are feared and driven away as ghosts; but they are wanted in their more acceptable form, as babies.

That Mother Earth is both cradle and grave is a very old idea, well explained by Dieterich (*Mutter Erde, passim*), and Mr. T. C. Hodson has done not a little to expound what is perhaps even nearer the primitive idea—namely, that the generations of men are nothing but an ever-returning cycle of life, in which the individual is of account only at the dynamic moments of his birth, marriage, and death, when he acts, so to speak, as the conductor of the current. That the orientation of the dead is connected with such ideas is to me well-nigh certain, for the following among other reasons.

1. In parts of Australia great care is taken to face the dead man in the right direction, which is towards his own home or his *altcheringa* camp—the practice seems to vary. See Spencer-Gillen, *Native Tribes*, p. 496; A. R. Brown, *J.R.A.I.*, LXIII. (1913), p. 169, for examples. Now every right-think-

ing Arunta knows, and other tribes enjoy much the same knowledge, that spirit-children live in a *nanja*, or store-house of souls, and from time to time pass into the body of any woman who happens to be near the place, for purposes of reincarnation.

2. The Wawanga of British East Africa, whose customs show clear traces of belief in reincarnation, are careful to bury certain classes of their dead facing the door or the central pole of the hut, in which they are buried, without its ceasing to be used as a dwelling, the idea clearly being that they will then have abundant opportunities of re-entering the womb of a woman of their own village (*J.R.A.I.*, *ibid.*, pp. 33, 34.)

3. One of the reasons for securing the safe transit of the soul to Hades is surely the fact that from Hades the new souls come, in popular belief as in any Platonic myth.

4. Various classes of the dead are always specially treated—e.g., women who die in childbirth, magicians, great chiefs, homicides and their victims, and so forth. Of these, certain ones, the bad or undesirable so far as the tribe is concerned (for who wants a wizard to be born into a decent clan and perhaps ruin it with his villanous spells?), are after buried in a special way. To cite the Wawanga again, their *βαιοθάνατοι* are buried away from the hut and with special rites—no one wants those unlucky wights again—and, as we know, suicides in Greece and Rome alike had special burial (Aesch. in *Ctes.* 244, Serv. on *Aen.* XII. 603). From this I fancy spring two ideas: one, that certain of the dead cannot be re-born, but go to a special place—a notion which we see naively set forth in the beliefs of the Elemas of the Papuan Gulf (Rev. J. Holmes in *J.R.A.I.*, XXXII, 1902, p. 428), while its highest expression is to be found in the teachings of Pindar, Plato, and Virgil, drawing on Orphic-Pythagorean sources, that certain glorified spirits come no more to earth, but return to the godhead whence they set out. The second idea is a curious form of ritual, according to which, not classes of persons, but a whole sex, receives a peculiar form of burial or a different orientation—as among the Colchians

in old times (Ap. Rhod. III. 200 ff.) and e.g. the Kajji of Nigeria in our own (Major Tremearne in *J.R.A.I.*, XLII., 1912, p. 167). With regard to the former development, I would point out in passing how absurd it is to imagine that Orphism borrowed from the East so wide spread and popular a doctrine as reincarnation. To suppose that such developed systems as we find at an early date in India, for example, were laid under contribution for ideas which Pythagoras taught in the infancy of Western philosophy would be like imagining that the Buddhist objection to meat has an English origin because some of our vegetarians urge dietetic reasons against eating it.

But we have, I think, clearer reasons than the doctrines of Pythagoreanism for holding that reincarnation was a Greek and also an Italian popular belief, at least in early times. In Attica we have the evidence, admirably interpreted by Dr. Jevons (*Class. Rev.*, 1895, p. 247 ff.), of the law quoted in Demosth. c. *Macart.* 62, forbidding women outside the degree of second cousins and under sixty to enter the house or follow the funeral of the deceased. Imagine the consternation in ghostly society if a Eupatrid were to commit, in the natural confusion following death, the *faux pas* of reincarnating himself in the womb of a plebeian neighbour or a casual Thracian slave-girl! In Rome the evidence is less clear, but the last breath is received by a near relative; the next of kin keep close guard around the hearse and the pyre, and dying and new-born alike are laid on the ground; while for my own part I am still of opinion that the original place of burial was often the house.

But it may be said that all this leads us nowhere. It is clear that orientation of some sort is a possibility in Greece and Italy, but the fact remains that the unburned bodies, where they have been investigated from this point of view at all, point in all conceivable directions. This surely indicates that the practice, if it ever existed, had died out before our evidence can be said to begin. I would answer this in two ways.

1. Orientation, as I have noted, does not necessarily mean celestial orienta-

tion, or even terrestrial orientation on some prominent and far-distant object such as a holy city or mountain. The conditions would be abundantly satisfied if it were shown that in any given district the tomb or tombs of a family pointed towards the estate belonging to that family. So far as I am aware, not an inch of classical ground has yet been investigated from this point of view. Moreover, in the case of a house-like tomb the position of the door is I think enough, and that of the body is a secondary matter. Lastly, and this is an important point, we have seen that it is possible to orient by laying the dead man alongside of the road or river on which he must travel. I have given a Bornese example; an excellent one from Denmark will be found in Déchelette, *op. cit.* II., p. 131.

2. Granted that some one community, Megara or what you will, had agreed on some one way of orientating, say W.-E. Still, that would apply only to the normal dead, who had not come to their end untimely, by violence, plague, etc. Is it too much to suppose that in a turbulent little community of early Greece, war, pestilence, childbirth, infant mortality, and the like, would account for some 40 per cent. or more of all the deaths? If their graves were all turned a different way from the rest, the result would be an imposing array of counter-instances, which yet would rather confirm than weaken the general theory. Further, suppose that they began by orienting eastward, that their dead might the more readily reach the sea, thence to sail to some sort of a Dorian Hades; if it were later expounded at them that Homeric orthodox placed Hades in the West, they might very well gradually adapt themselves to the new topography, and begin to orient their graves as Hereas says they did. All these suppositions, while so far as I know hypothetical in our present state of knowledge of Megara, are supported by numerous instances from actual practice elsewhere.

Finally, what are the facts, firstly for Greece? Here I make no profession of expert knowledge, and partial know-

ledge is dangerous. Thus, if one notices that the barrows in Gaul have a tendency to be oriented W.-E., he may think that this is good evidence of the existence of a sun-cult in that region; but if he crosses the Rhine and notes that many of them there point E.-W., he will see that he must reckon with the possibility of the Rhine having been a river of souls, as in the Bornese instance (Déchelette I. 389; II. 151-152, 157). Still, tentatively I would point out, firstly, that there is some archaeological evidence for Solon's view (see A. Westermann's note on the passage in his edition of the *Life of Solon*, Brunswick and London, 1840; I have not yet come across the article to which he refers); secondly, that there is a great tendency to line the roads with tombs and to bury almost on the threshold of cities (see any handbook, and add E. Curtius, *Zur Gesch. des Wegebaus*, Berlin, 1855, pp. 52, 61). Now the latter practice may simply mean a desire for the protection of a hero in his tomb, and the former was often interpreted as satisfying the longing of the dead for human company; cf. the frequent *χαῖρε παροδῖτα, τοῖς παράγουσι χαίρειν*, etc., of the epitaphs. But if there was not also the conception of roads as the pathway of souls, why do they so swarm with gods, Apollo Agyieus and Hermes, the former at least to keep the living safe, and Hekate at every cross-way to see to the dead? The whole archaeological evidence here would repay more study than it has yet had in this connexion.

Coming to Italy, we find again the familiar streets of tombs to which we may attach the same meaning, especially when we note the eagerness of some to be so buried (see for an old example Morestelli *Pompa Feralis* in Graevius' *Thes. Ant. Rom.* XII. col. 1418); but we can go back to a much earlier stage than this. The evidence of the practice of the early populations, as given in Peet, *Stone and Bronze Ages*, may be thus summarised; we know nothing of the methods of the palaeolithic peoples; the neolithic (? Ligurian) dead, if flexed, face more or less eastward, while one extended body at least faces W.; the chalcolithic age gives a similar result,

with the exception of the tombs at Cumarola, whose occupants face N. We are reminded that the faithful were by no means of one mind as to whether a *templum* should have as its *decumanus* the N.-S. or the E.-W. line (Nissen *Templum*, p. 11 ff.). The Siculi did not orient, so far as we can make out; the terramare people lived and were buried in *templa*. Add to these the Hallstatt invaders, whose tombs in their own land ran regularly E.-W. (Déchelette II. p. 603), and a great part of the population of historical Italy is accounted for. A search through *Monumenti Antichi* and *Not. degli Scavi* will provide many more examples, mostly of early date, which I have no space for now, but which tend to show, particularly in Etruria, the classical ground of the *templum*, very numerous tombs arranged parallel either to the *cardo* or to the *decumanus* of a normally oriented *templum*, and one district, Novilara (see Brizio in *Mon. Ant.* V. col. 167), where after many changes a S.E.-N.W. direction became canonical.

But let me take one district, Etruria, in a little more detail. Martha, *L'Art étrusque*, pp. 217 ff., notes that although it is almost incredible that a people who were so elaborately careful to make *templa* of their cities, etc., should not do so in their burial-grounds, still the fact remains that he cannot, either from the plans in Dennis' *Cities and Cemeteries* or from any other source, find trace of orientation in any of them. We have to-day more evidence than he enjoyed, and the upshot of such of it as I have seen I interpret thus.

An E.-W. direction for pit-graves is common at all times; see *Notiz. d. Scav.* XI. (1914-15), p. 27. As to Dennis, it is clear from the text that he saw no guiding principle for the larger tombs, but more than one of his plans tell a different story. His map of Castel d'Asso (I. p. 272, 'Everyman' edition) makes it clear that the great tombs there line the banks of two small streams, the Rio Arcione and a tributary of it. At Norchia they occupy the

same position relative to the Fosso delle Pile and the Fosso dell' Acqua Alta. Surely, for a maritime people this provides the soul with his *viaticum* seaward and—to Lydia? Again, over and over again they line roads, and at Vulci they seem to do both. Elsewhere, as I have already stated, we find a celestial orientation; and finally we have at Caere (Cervetri) a most instructive cemetery. The early tombs, dating from about the middle of saec. VIII. B.C., have no orientation that can now be traced; but in saec. IV. the cemetery was laid out regularly, like a town, with parallel streets to which all the tombs conform like houses (B. Novara in *Notiz. d. Scav.* XII. p. 348). Have we not here the *templum*-idea at last triumphing over the strong conservatism of aristocratic grave-ritual, as it had long ago won its way everywhere else? Culturally Etruria was a debtor-nation, borrowing in art from Greece, in her earliest architecture from Asia, in religion from the people around her; in this important point of ritual she seems to have been very early the debtor of that energetic people from the North, the folk of the terramare, who seem to have brought wheat and the vine with them into Italy, to the disgust of conservative spirits like Iuppiter Farreus and the Bona Dea.

I have said, I hope, enough to indicate the interest of this subject. Most of the work has still to be done, and I would not guarantee one of my conclusions as yet; but if those who are interested in archaeology would but keep this idea in view, we should soon have a mass of material ready which, when sifted, might throw great light on the wanderings of ancient peoples, the interrelations of the states from which sprung our complex culture, and that subject of perennial interest, the hopes and fears of man with regard to his destiny after death.

H. J. ROSE.

University College,
Aberystwyth.

TERENTIANA.

(Continued from *Class. Rev.* XXXII. 99 and XXXIII.)

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

1. In these papers I am avoiding altogether the use of the word *accent*. It conveys one meaning in French and another in English. The use of the term *intensity* seems preferable, because it is unambiguous.

2. For the same reason, instead of the equivocal metaphors of such terms as 'rise' and 'fall,' to describe the two internal constituents of a foot, I use the convenient, because quite unambiguous, expressions '*fort*' and '*faible*' as the English equivalents of *temps fort* and *temps faible*.

If the cause why *quis*, *quid* exercises (I think we may now say) invariably the effect of overriding the rule of position in the subjoining syllable of a weak word be—as it appears to be—the intensity of the interrogative, then should we find that *ego*, which, like *quis*, idiomatically tends to attract and subjoin to itself a weak demonstrative pronoun in the order of the sentence, does also, like *quis*, invariably (or normally) set in motion the phonetic tendency known as *Breves Breviantes*, may we not conclude that the emphasis of *ego* expressed itself in pronunciation by that *intensity* (*cum accentu*) which we know the interrogative possessed?

Let us first study the combination *ego—ille*:

Andr. 146 pro uxore habere hanc peregrinam.
ego illud sedulo. . . .

" 968 prius rescisceres tu quam *ego illud*
quod tibi euenit boni.

Haut. 312 CLIT. eho scelestes, quo illam ducis?
SV. quô *ego illam*? ad nos scilicet.

" 779 SV. id ipsum. CH. at *ego illi* neque
do neque despondeo.

Eun. 223 tandem non *ego illam* caream?

" 239 hic *ego illum* contempsi prae me. . . .

" 643 ubi *ego illum* scelerosum misera. . . .

" 657 PH. insanis: qui istuc facere eunuchus potuit? PV. *ego illum* nescio.

Phor. 391 DE. neque *ego illum* noram nec
mihi cognatus fuit.

" 437 abducere, *ego illum* eiciam. dixi,
Phormio.

" 974 hisce *ego illum* dictis ita tibi incensam dabo.

Hec. 239 tuos esse *ego illi* mores morbum
magis quam ullam aliam rem
arbitror.

¹ *Hec.* 604 si cetera ita sunt ut tu uis itaque² ut
esse *ego illa* existimo.

Ad. 116 mihi peccat: *ego illi* maximam
partem fero.

¹ " 268 *ego illum* uero omitto qui quidem te
habeam fratrem, Aeschine.

" 359 ubi *ego illum* quaeram? credo abductum in ganeam.

" 866 *ego ille* agrestis, saeuos, tristis, parcus, truculentus, tenax.

" 940 Æ. fac: promisi *ego illis*. MI. promisti autem?

Here there are eighteen examples of the normal, against which are to be considered six, viz.:

(a) *Andr.* 428:

ego illum uidi: uirginem forma bona
memini uidere.

*D*¹ read *ego uidi*, and *G* has all words before *bona* in *rasura*.

The words are merely disarranged: correct to:

ego uidi: memini uirginem forma bona
illam uideri.

Bothe suggested *uideri*.

(b) *Haut.* 678:

retraham hercle opinor idem ad me *ego illud*
hodie fugitiuum argentum tamen.

So *A*; but great confusion reigns in the MSS. The verse is hypermetric; only *A* has the *ego*. If the *ego* is right, the superfluous word (and the word which was bound to be added as a gloss) is *argentum*. Eliminate *argentum* and all is well with sense and metre. However, this line, as reported, is not solid enough to stand as a rebutting instance against the canon *ego—ille*.

(c) *Eun.* 479:

THR. *ego illum* eunuchum, si opus sit, uel
sobrius. . . .

Commentators are in such a hurry to get away from an obscene verse that they have not even had time to remark

¹ The readings are doubtful, but not for my present purpose.

² For *itaque* see Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 605.

that its metre is as perverse as its morality.

On the analogy of v. 426 *lepus tute es* it may be suggested that for EUNUCHUM Terence wrote CUNICLUM, since the Romans classified *cuniculus* as a species of *lepus*: see Varro, R.R. III. xii. 6. The equivoque will account for Donatus' otherwise obscure remark 'hoc ut militare est, ita importunum praesente Thaide'.¹ The jest has an Elizabethan crudity: see Donatus ad v. 426. But there is a sort of eutrapelia. Donatus can hardly mean that the mere grossness is *militare*. There must be an allusion to something technical.

(d) *Eun.* 591:

ego homuncio hoc non facerem? ego illud uero ita feci ac lubens.

Thus *A contra metrum*. Various remedies have been prescribed: most editors adopt Bothe's *item* for *ita*. But *ego uero illud* of *G* is a more probable, because a more idiomatic, order. This is not the only place where this excellent codex seems to preserve a right reading:

ego homuncio hoc non facerem? ego uero illud ita feci ac lubens.

But in either event the last syllable of *facerem* is unelided, thanks to the pause.

(e) *Eun.* 615:

ita me di ament, quantum ego illum uidi, non nihil timeo misera.

Such is the vulgate (Bentley, Umpfenbach, Fabia, etc.), but all the Calliopians and *corr. antiquus* in *A* read,

ita me dí bene amént quantum égo illum . . .

which, I know not why, Fabia calls unmetrical. Unusual it may be; but *ita-me-di-bene-ament* receives the same metrical treatment in *Eun.* 882. We are now entitled to say on the contrary that *ego illum* is unmetrical, and follow the consensus of MSS. which gets rid of it.

Thus far only in two passages, (a) and (c), does the tradition definitely quarrel with our *ego—ille* canon; in either case a change palaeographically cheap will put things to rights; and in

¹ There is indeed a phrase in Arnobius (*Adv. Gentes* IV. 7): *etiamne militaris Uenus castrensibus flagitiis praesidet et puerorum stupris?*

only one of these was the reading otherwise than on this metrical ground unobjectionable. Against the one apparent exception outstanding therefore may be brought to bear the preponderance of the eighteen certain and five not improbable examples of the canon. If the last objection can be solved, the case will be clear.

(f) *Phor.* 944:

PH. haec {adeo illi (*A*)
adeo ego illi (*Call.*)} iam denarabo. CH. obsecro. . . .

Editors reject the reading of *A* as unmetrical; but we can now see that the Calliopian reading *ego illi* is no less unmetrical.

Now, since *adeo* emphasises the word it follows, it is important to ascertain the exact point of the sentence: does Phormio say, 'And *this* is what I am going to tell her all about'; or rather, 'And *I am the person* who is going to tell her all about it'? According as you decide the question, you find the type of phrase in

hoc adeo ex hac re uenit in mentem mihi (*Eun.* 233).

or in

ego adeo hanc primus inueni uiam (*Eun.* 247).

It seems to me that *ego adeo* and not *haec adeo* is what the tenor of the passage indicates. If so, the metrical enormity is corrected by reading

haec ego adeo illi iam denarabo.

For *adeo* in the faible of the foot (it is much commoner in the forte), cf. *Eun.* 806, 964.

Next, *ego—is*.

Eun. 162 TH. *ego id* timeo? PH. quid te ergo aliud sollicitat? cedo.

Hec. 372 mé uenísse: *ego éius* uidéndi cúpidus récta cónsequor.

(For *éius* see *Phor.* 113 with Dziatzko-Hauler's note *ad loc.*)

No exceptions.

Next, *ego—iste, istic*.

Andr. 921 *égo istaec* móueo aut cúro?

" 953 PA. recte admones: Dauo *ego istuc* dedam iam negoti. Si. non potest.

Haut. 110 *ego istuc* aetatis non amori operam dabam.

" 593 CH. *égo istuc* cúrabo. SV. atqui núnç, ere, tñbi *istic* ádseruándus est.

Eun. 94 aut *ego istuc* abs te factum nihili penderem.

Phor. 530 iste me fefellit: *ego isti* nihilo sum aliter ac fui.

" 726 DE. idem *ego istuc* facere possum. CH. mulier mulieri magis conuenit.

Hec. 877 Immō uero scio neque hōc imprūdēns fēci. PAM. *ego istuc* satis scio.

Ad. 158 *ego istam* inuitis omnibus (troch. dim.).

" 845 MI. modo facito ut illam serues. DE. *ego istuc* uidero.

" 962 *ego istos* uobis usque a pueris curauī ambos sedulo.

To these eleven unquestioned examples may be added as probable:

Ad. 551:

Sv. *ego* cauebo. CT. nunquam hercle { hodie *ego istuc* (A) } committam tibi.
{ *ego hodie istuc* (Call.) }

A's *ego istuc* sins against the rule, the Calliopians do not; but perhaps the likeliest reading is

numquam hercle *ego istuc* hodie . . .

Against which are the following refractory instances:

(a) *Andr.* 332:

PA. nuptias effūgere *ego istas* malo quam tu apiscier.

Unlike most, this case shows no variant in the MS. report and no other grounds for a suspicion that the text is unsound, unless it be that *ego* is deferred surprisingly late in the sentence and the verse rhythm contradicts the emphasis. One may be permitted to suggest a rearrangement of words which will abolish the anomaly,

nuptias *ego istas* effugere malo quam tu apiscier,

or (what would be preferable),

ego istas nuptias effugere, etc.

(b) *Andr.* 456:

DA. commoui. SI. *ego ista*ec recte ut fiant uidero.

This is to be regarded as another case of hiatus at a change of speakers: then *ego ista*ec remains normal.

There are five examples of *egone—ille, iste, istuc*:

Eun. 65 *egone illam* . . . quae illum . . . quae me . . . quae non . . . sine modo!

Phor. 260 *egone illi* non suscenseam? ipsum gestio.

" 304 *egone illam* cum illo ut patiar nuptam unum diem?

Andr. 584 SI. propterea quod amat filius. DA. *egone istuc* facerem? SI. credidi.

filius lengthened by the pause and change of speaker.

Andr. 270 MY. ne deseras se. PAM. hēm? ēgōne istuc conari queam?

There is no instance of any accentuation but *égon* in Terence (*Andr.* 384, 504, *Eun.* 757, *Haut.* 784, 1016, *Ph.* 431, 999, *Hec.* 852, *Ad.* 184) or *égone* (*Eun.* 191, 778, 1026, *Haut.* 945, *Ph.* 938, *Hec.* 849). It distinctly appears that the *-ne* has a nonconducting effect and *ego* loses its intensity.

I have reserved the consideration of *ego—hic* because certain inherent difficulties make the case less clear. We can now approach it fortified by the probability that as *quis—hic* and *quis—ille* agreed, so *ego—hic* will conform to the usage of *ego—ille*. The examples are of three sorts:

(1) Those where the shortening is necessary to the scansion of the verse:

Andr. 708 PA. *ego hānc* uisam. DA. quid tu? quō hinc te agis?

Phor. 529 nam hic me huius modi esse scibat, *ego hānc* esse aliter credidi.

Eun. 494 *ego hānc* abeo: tu istanc opperire. PA. haud conuenit.

(2) Those where the shortening is possible:

Hec. 453 quamobrem non redducam? LA. nescioquē *ego hīc* audiui loqui.

Ad. 553 SV. age tamen *ego hānc* amouebo. DE. sed ecum sceleratum Syrum.

¹ " 312 ut *ego hānc* iram in eos euomam omnem dum aegritudo haec est recens.

Haut. 134 eum *ego hīnc* eieci miserum iniustitia mea.

" 586 abire hinc aliquo. CL. quō *ego hīnc* abeam? SV. quo lubet: da illis locum.

Eun. 738 sed eccam ipsam: miror ubi *ego hīnc* anteuerterim.

" 763 tu abi atque obsera ostium intus dūm *ego hīnc* transcurro ad forum.

" 1060 semper. TH. do fidem futurum. GN. adcingar. PH. quem *ego hīc* audio?

² *Hec.* 429 ite intro. *ego hīnc* adibo si quid me uelit.

¹ The reading of BCDEFGP ut iram hanc in eos may be right.

² The hiatus will be due to the pause. One is rather surprised not to find uos ite intro as in *Andr.* 28. Another case of hiatus after a full pause is *Ad.* 47: nati filii

dūo. | inde *ego hīnc* | maiorem adoptauī mihi

Andr. 776 nisi puerum tollis iam *ego hunc* in mediam uiam.

Haut. 1055 quod *ego hunc* aequum censeo. CL. pater, omnia faciam: impera.

Ad. 202 age iam cupio, modo si argentum reddat. sed *ego hoc* hariolor.

„ 889 era, *ego hunc* ad hos prouiso quam mox uirginem. . . .

Phor. 982 adsequere, retine dum *ego hunc* seruos euoco (*cf. Eun.* 763 cited above).

The following are doubtful in reading:

Hec. 875 *ego hunc* ab Orco mortuom? quo pacto? PAM. nescis, Parmeno.

egon BCDEFP (if right, a unique instance of *egone*—*hic* in combination).

This verse and its sequel,

quantum hodie profueris mihi et ex quanta aerumna extraxeris,

are preceded by six trochaics and succeeded by a pair of iambic octonarii. How are they to be scanned? On which rhythm must the actor start?

ego hunc ab Orco . . .

or

ego hunc ab Orco . . .?

In the absence of any other determinant, it seems reasonable to infer that, *ego* being much more emphatic than *hunc*, and *quantum* (an interrogative) than *hodie*, the lines are both trochaic:

Hec. 712 ^{(ideo ego hoc (A))}
(id ego hoc (cell.)) praesente tibi nolueram dicere.

The reading of *A* (*solus contra mundum*) seems to me to be sound, preserving a rare though correct proceleusmatic *idēo ego hoc*. If so, the instance falls to be added to the list of those where the scansion *ego hoc* is not merely possible but necessary. *Ideo* gives a more satisfactory sense. The reason why Phidippus was loth to tell Laches in Pamphilus' hearing is just that Philomena herself is the source of his information; he did not want Pamphilus to know that he had been making indiscreet inquiries. *Ideo* is therefore more in point than *id*.

Haut. 785-7. SV. scite poterat fieri: et *ego hoc* quia dudum tu tantopere suaseras
(*ego (A)*)
(*eo (cell.)*) coepi.

Here, I take it, the right one of the two alternative readings *eo hoc* . . . *ego coepi* or *ego hoc* . . . *eo coepi* is the former; since Terence has three times

the arrangement *eo (eone) quia* (*Eun.* 415, *Haut.* 505 and 554) and only once the contrary one (*Eun.* 97) with *non quo*.

(3) We are left with definitely rebutting instances, which must either be shown to be corrupt on other grounds and by palaeographically easy means curable, or the case for *ego*—*hic* as universally true will be destroyed.

(a) *Ad.* 42 *ego hunc* clementem uitam urbanam atque otium secutus sum.

No variant in the MSS.; a confirmatory lemma in Donatus; a confirmatory phrase in Cicero (*pro Rabir. Post.* VII.) 'hanc uitam quietam atque otiosam secuti sumus'; the unanimity of editors—what presumption if one dares to call this verse in question! $\delta \delta'$ ἀνὴρ ὁ λέγων οὕτως τιννοῦτοςί.

Yet in that unanimity of editors there was just a flaw of suspicion, for Bentley wrote 'uide an legendum sit'

ego hanc clementem uitam urbanumque otium, and cited Cicero *ad Fam.* XII. 1:

ut *ego* quidem et urbi et otio diffiderem urbano.

His ear condemned the lopsidedness of

hanc clementem uitam urbanam

set against the solitary *otium*.

Add to this a close consideration of Demea's words in the scene which makes the counterpart to this opening soliloquy of Micio's, '*ego ille* agrestis, saeuos, tristis, parcus, truculentus, tenax, duxi uxorem' (866, 7). Is it asking too much to beg for an IL and an & and read

EGOHANCILLEMENTEMETVITAM . . .

Ego ille . . . secutus 'I am he who went in for. . .'

With *ille ego* the ellipse of *sum* is optional (see Henry, *Aeneidea*, Vol. I., p. 61); Demea's *ego ille* in 866 corresponds. The order of words is like *sub hoc ille tecto* in Seneca *Ep. Mor.* 86. 5.

The next lion in my path is

(β) *Ad.* 757 *ego hōs* conuenio^{am} *A* (m corr. et deleuit recens)
ego hōs conueniam *BCDEFGP*.

I contend that either of these starts the actor on a false rhythm, for *ego hōs conueniam* is the opening of trochaic verse.

The solution is exceedingly simple:

both readings are accounted for if the original was

ego hōs conuenibo,

and the metre is mended.

Andr. 766 *My.* eho an non est? *CH.* recte ego hōs semper fugi nuptias.

So *DG* have it; but in the rest,

recte ego semper fugi has nuptias,

which is less plausible, for whatever may be decided about the metrical question, it is undoubted that the collocation of *ego has* is idiomatic.

Ad. 527 rogabit mē ubi fuerim: 'ēgo hōc te toto non uidi die.'

This reading of Krauss' (adopted by most of the recent editors, but not by Plessis) is not a certainty, but I am only concerned here to remark that in its treatment of the *ego hōc* it is correct.

Haut. 1012 non postulo: iam loquere. nihilo minus *ego hōc* faciam tamen (*A* omits *ego*).

I cannot in candour deny that this is a very troublesome verse. But since *A* omits *ego*, the verse cannot be called certain. In support of the omission of *ego*, it may be urged that Chremes does not address Sostrata as *tu*; and pronouns are usually placed by Terence in contrasted pairs. And, further, a word which in the Terence tradition is frequently mistaken for *EGO* would be relevant here. I mean *EO*:

nihilo minus *eo hoc* faciam tamen

would be unobjectionable. 'None the less for that, i.e. for your talking.'

Phor. 659 *utrum stultitia* facere hunc an malitia.

So *A*; the rest 'facere *ego* hunc.'

Are there any grounds, other than metrical, for an impeachment of the vulgate reading? There are, if the author's usage may be relied on for guidance. *Facere* = 'to act' with a defining adverb is not uncommon in Terence: *utrum stulte facere an malitiose* would be regular. Then as the equivalent for our 'to do so,' a device to avoid repeating a verb (Gk. τοῦτο ποιῆν), we have it often. Terence's practice is worth tabulating on this point; it is as follows:

hoc facere, never.

id facere four times (*Andr.* 727, *Eun.* 956, *Haut.* 107, 136).

ita facere once (*Eun.* 724).

facere absolute, frequently,¹ especially in *Hautontim.*

But here we have no preceding verb for which *facere* could serve as a ditto. Unless then anybody can produce an analogy from Terence to show that *stultitia facit* can mean *stultitia hoc facit*, it seems to me probable that a defining word is missing, which, when restored, should also regulate the prosody of *ego hūnc*. The choice is practically confined to *hoc* (*haec*)—*id* (*ea*)—and *ita*. Of these the first is precluded by the presence of *hunc*. Either then

utrum stultitia facere <ea> *ēgo hūnc* an malitia,

or

utrum stultitia <itā> *facere ēgo hūnc* an malitia.

These presuppose the soundness of the *ego*; but if *A*'s reading be taken as the basis, one might easily emend to

utrum stultitia facere <ea> *hunc* an malitia.

Whereas of the collocation *ego—hic* there are some twenty-five examples, it is curious how very rare is the contrary order, with which we are so familiar in the dactylic poets. I think Terence has it in only four places: *haec ego*, *Andr.* 113; *hoc ego*, *Andr.* 506, and *Hec.* 153; and *hancine ego*, *Hec.* 282.

Examples of other weak syllables similarly affected by *ego* are:

Phor. 167 *quid ego ex hac inopia* nunc capiam, et *quid tu ex ista copia*.

Andr. 480 *nunc huius periclo fit, ego in portu nauigo*.

Hec. 42 *ego interea meum non potui tutari locum*.

Eun. 159 *ego excludor*.

Haut. 79 *rectumst? ego ut faciam*.

And perhaps

Haut. 984 *et, quantum ego intellegere possum*. . .

And a peculiar instance of an oblique case highly emphasised, exerting the same effect as *ego*, is:

Phor. 673 *mea causa eiicitur: mē hōc est aequom amittere*.

¹ Here is the list: Positive, *Eun.* 388; *Haut.* 236, 730, 957 (*DG* have 'id faciunt'), 996, 1057; *Ad.* 750, 916. Negative, *Andr.* 276; *Eun.* 901; *Phor.* 121, 945; *Haut.* 416, 797, 1049, 1051; *Hec.* 590.

In conclusion of this and in preparation for the next paper, let me say a word in answer to an objection which has reached me privately. The writer is one who speaks with admitted authority on these matters. He says: 'The difficulty in this question is the danger of reasoning in a circle. I hope you will adduce *independent* evidence (i.e. not the evidence of verse itself) for the "intensity" of the words you mention.'

In reply to this I would say: (1) that I began the inquiry with the Interrogatives just because there is explicit evidence in the grammarians, as early as Quintilian, that (as in our modern languages, be it noted) these were differentiated in pronunciation from the Relatives by their *accentus*. If the Demonstratives, in particular, when subjoined to *quis*, etc., are regularly attacked by iambic weakening, I infer that the cause lies in the grouping: the known pronunciation of *quis*, etc., in the ordinary language, its extra intensity (i.e. added force and raised tone) is what depletes the recessive partner in the group.

(2) That comedy conformed to the spoken language, and that no violence was done by Terence and Co. to the ordinary pronunciation of phrases like *Quid istic? ita-me-di-ament, ob-eam-rem* by the position given to them in a verse, I should regard as self-evident; just as in English you cannot alter the pronunciation of groups and phrases (e.g. *How d' you do?*) without making your verse ridiculous. But if it should

be called in question, one could cite the chain of testimony, beginning with Terence's own prologues and continuing through the grammarians (e.g. Keil, Vol. III., p. 418), to the effect that he deliberately lowered the poetical pitch of language in comedy: *Ne sint sonora uerba consuetudinis*, as Terentian. Maur. says.

(3) The objection may be retorted. For if *Breves Breviantes* were a metrical and not a phonetic principle of Latin, why should its effects be visible in single words? How could a metrical law produce *modō, benē, sciō*, etc.? Surely no one supposes that in conversation one said *modō, benē, sciō*, and *modō, benē, sciō* were literary and poetical?

(4) If it is a phonetic phenomenon, it has taken place before the word or group goes into the verse, and the position of the conglomerate in the verse depends on its pronunciation, not *vice versa*.

O how d' you dō, sir?

It is not the verse ictus which puts the accent on *dō*; the phrase is necessarily so arranged to take the ictus of the verse, because its accent cannot be altered without absurdity—especially in colloquial verse.

It is proposed next to follow the clue of the 'Recessives' *hic, ille*, and observe their behaviour when subjoined to some other monosyllables with a view to determining whether these also were not 'intense' in pronunciation.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

Glasgow.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS.

A. ATHENAEUS.

In the *Classical Quarterly*, 1908, No. 3, I offered a number of emendations in the text of Athenaeus. Repeated reading of that author has further convinced me of the unsatisfactoriness of Kaibel's Teubner text. It is true that the editing is generally cautious, nor can one reasonably object to sundry passages being left entirely unintelligible by an editor who has the rather rare courage to con-

fess 'non capio' or 'non intellego.' Nevertheless—apart from the fact that some of these passages can be rendered intelligible by ordinary processes—there are certain defects of the edition which should prevent it from standing as the last word upon the text of an author who ought to be read much more widely than he is at present. The paragraphing (which is of the greatest moment in Athenaeus) is on the whole rational, although there are many places in which

it is positively misleading. More seriously one may complain of the lack of technical judgment sometimes exhibited in the inclusion, or the mention, of a conjecture. It is high time that scholars abandoned the practice of inserting or substituting words which merely 'make sense,' while no ocular or other reason is assigned for the omission or the misreading as we find it. For instance, in 1B it would in any case scarcely be good textual criticism to alter τῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ παρασκευῆς to τῆς ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ παρασκευῆς (a conjecture of Kaibel himself). There is no palaeographical resemblance between δείπνῳ and λόγῳ, and the conjecture is doubly bad, inasmuch as the text is quite sound, the sense being simply 'of the courses described in the narrative.' This, perhaps, is an unusually violent example, and it is a pity that it should face us on the second page. What it betrays is the absence of a rigid technical standard. While Kaibel allowed himself—for personal reasons, as his preface indicates—to be unduly influenced by Wilamowitz, and therefore to print a number of poor and hasty conjectures of that scholar along with the few convincing ones, he must often (it would appear) have devoted insufficient time to the annotations of Casaubon as amplified by Schweighäuser. Thus in 206D we have: Διοκλείδης μὲν ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης θαυμάζεται ἐπὶ τῇ πρὸς τὴν Ῥοδίων πόλιν ὑπὸ Δημητρίου προσαχθείσῃ τοῖς τείχεσιν ἐλεπόλει, Τίμαιος δ' ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ τῇ κατασκευασθείσῃ Διουνσίῳ τῷ Σικελίας τυραννῷ κ.τ.λ. Since Diocleides did not invent the ἐλέπολις, nor Timaeus the πυρά, but since both of them (like the rest in the list which follows) were merely writers who expressed their sense that such things were θαύματα, I had laboured to the conclusion that what Athenaeus wrote was θαυματίζειται ('makes a wonderment'). After obtaining Casaubon's notes I found that he virtually suggests that word. Yet Kaibel, while feeling and noting the difficulty, has no mention of the suggestion, but prefers to say 'haec omnia audacissime truncata.'

Again the editor is not always apt at an idiom. Thus in 3F ὁ δὲ Χίος Ἴων τραγῳδῖαν νικήσας Ἀθήνησιν ἐκάστω τῶν

Ἀθηναίων ἔδωκε Χίον κεράμιον. Kaibel's obvious Χίον (sc. οἶνον) is actually less idiomatic, as any reader of the private speeches of Demosthenes should know, than Χίον (with the same implication). So in 75A <-ο-ο> συκᾶς φυτεύω πάντα πλὴν Λακωνικῆς he quotes without comment the <καὶ γένῃ> συκῆς of Blaydes. καὶ γένῃ is plausible enough (since ταδὶ λέγων immediately precedes), but συκᾶς πάντα γένῃ ('figtrees of all kinds') is as idiomatic Greek as 'porticus avibus omne genus oppletae' (Varr. R.R. 3. 5. 11) is idiomatic Latin. Nor is his ear very acute for metre. For example, in 397A, in illustration of the point that peacocks were once rare in Greece, Athenaeus quotes Antiphanes, and then adds καὶ Εὐβουλὸς ἐν Φοίνικι· καὶ γὰρ ὁ ταῶς διὰ τὸ σπάνιον θαυμάζεται. Kaibel remarks 'Eubuli verba interciderunt,' evidently imagining the words καὶ γὰρ . . . θαυμάζεται to be a weak repetition by Athenaeus himself. Yet it should be obvious that they form the very verse for which Kaibel was looking.

As a final criticism it may be urged that Athenaeus is a lover of humour—certainly an eager collector of the humorous—and his editor should therefore be blessed with a fair appreciation of that quality.

I venture to add the following to my previous notes:

237B-C (Kaibel's text):

δύ' ἐστὶ, Ναυσίτικε, παρασίτων γένῃ,
ἐν μὲν τῷ κοινῷ καὶ κεκομφομένῳ,
οἱ μέλανες ἡμεῖς· θάτερον ζητῶ γένος,
5 σεμνοπαράσιτον ἐκ μέσου καλούμενον,
4 σατράπας παρασίτους καὶ στρατηγούς ἐπιφανείς
ὑποκρινόμενον ἐν τοῖς βλοῖς.

The lines marked 5 and 4 stand as transposed by Dobree. Kaibel notes (1) 'ζητῶ suspectum'; (2) 'ἐκ μέσου corruptum'; (3) 'requiro etiam τὸ σεμνοπαράσιτον' (which, of course, will not scan); (4) 'σατράπας ξαχρύσους Dobr(ee)'. But as to ἐκ μέσου I am not at all sure that it is corrupt. I believe it to be simply 'Get out of the way!' (i.e. the haughty nabob parasite says to others 'Get out!'). ζητῶ is doubtless corrupt, and ζηλῶ (which would suggest itself at once) is away from the mark. The probable reading,

I suggest, is *σηστῶν*, which gives the required antithesis to *μέλανες*, the two classes being compared to black bread and bread of fine flour respectively. For the rest it is clear that the copyist had (so to speak) parasites on the brain. *παράσιτοι* are so much before his mind that he not only gives *σεμνοπαράσιτον* for *σεμνοπρόσωπον* (and so makes it necessary for some later corrector to eject the article), but also gives *σατράπας παρασίτους* for *σατράπας ἀπροσίτους* ('unapproachable'). Dobree's *ζαχρύσους* is technically too remote.

Read then:

θάτερον *σηστῶν* γένος,
τὸ σεμνοπρόσωπον, 'ἐκ μέσου' καλούμενον,
σατράπας ἀπροσίτους καὶ στρατηγούς ἐπιφανείς
ὑποκρινόμενον κ.τ.λ.

278B (from Archestratus):

τῇν δ' ἄμλαν φθινοπώρου, θῆαν Τλειᾶς καταδύνη,
πάντα τρόπον σκεύαζε, τί σοι τάδε μυθολογεῖς;
οὐ γὰρ μή ῥ' ἔσε διαφθείρηγ', οὐδ' ἂν ἐπιθνήμῃς.

The sense is manifestly 'You can't spoil it, even if you wish to.' Kaibel adopts the *οὐ γὰρ μὴ σὺ διαφθείρης* of Coraes. But why the emphatic *σὺ*? And why the corruption of case? More natural is *σφε*. The process of corruption would be, first *σφε* to *σε*, then an adaptation of the verb (which could no longer be second person) to *διαφθείρη*, and, last, the schoolboy stopgap γ' (which was so freely employed by inferior *διορθῶται*).

290B (the cook boasting of his skill):

οὐκ ἀλλὰ τὸ πέρας τῆς μαγειρικῆς, Σύρε,
φεύρημα μόνον εἶδέναι τῶν νομιζομένων ἐμέψ.

K. has *εὐρηκέναι πάντων νόμιζε μόνον ἐμέ*, partly from Schweighäuser, partly from Dobree. But why so far from the copy? Nearer is:

εὐρημ' ἐμόν, μόνον εἶδέναι νόμιζ' ἐμέ.

[*νομιζομένων* probably arose from the combination *νομιζεμε*, while the insertion of the article would naturally follow in an attempt to make sense.]

304B (from Hipponax):

κατέφαγε δὴ τὸν κλῆρον, ὥστε χρὴ σκάπτειν
πέτρας τορείας σῦκα μέτρια τρώγων
καὶ κρίθινον κόλλικα, δούλιον χόρτον.

So K. prints, simply remarking on the second line 'corruptus et fort. mutilus.' ὥστε χρὴ σκάπτειν τρώγων not

being Greek, and *τορείας* having no meaning, we may emend with

ὥς τέφρην σκάπτειν
πέτρας τ' ὄρεας.

The poor man is reduced to digging (not good productive land, but mere) *τέφρα* and mountain-side rocks. It was natural that in *ὥστε φρήσκαπτειν* the copyist should find *ὥστε*, and the Ionic form in *-η* added to the ease of corruption. The nominative participle is now, of course, correct.

Here, as a digression, may I draw attention to an almost universal misrendering of the passage in Aeschylus, *Agam.* 485 sqq., which is punctuated thus:

τίς ὦδε παιδὸς ἢ φρενῶν κεκομμένος,
φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν
νέος πυρωθέντα καρδίαν ἔπειτ'
ἀλλαγὰ λόγου καμῖν;
[ἐν] γυναικὸς αἰχμᾷ πρέπει
πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ξιναινέσαι
πιθανὸς ἄγαν ὁ θῆλυς ὄρος ἐπινέμεται κ.τ.λ.

How can (*ὥστε*) *πυρωθέντα καμῖν* stand for (*ὥστε*) *πυρωθεὶς καμῖν*? The solecism may be removed by punctuating:

τίς ὦδε παιδὸς ἢ φρενῶν κεκομμένος;
φλογὸς παραγγέλμασιν
νέος πυρωθέντα καρδίαν ἔπειτ'
ἀλλαγὰ λόγου καμῖν
[ἐν] γυναικὸς αἰχμᾷ πρέπει.
πρὸ τοῦ φανέντος χάριν ξιναινέσαι
πιθανὸς ἄγαν κ.τ.λ.

316E-F (from Pherecrates):

ὅπταν δ'
ἤδη πεινώσιν σφόδρα < . . >
ὥσπερ τοὺς πουλίποδας
< . . > νύκτωρ περιτρώ-
γειν αὐτῶν τοὺς δακτύλους.

Wilamowitz offers *σφόδρ' ἄγαν*. The following *ὥς*- rather suggests the loss of *πως*, i.e. *σφόδρα πως*. For the rest the lines may be made normal by reading:

ὥσπερ τοὺς πουλίποδας
δακτύλους νύκτωρ περιτρώ-
γειν αὐτοὺς τοὺς αὐτῶν.

320A (from Archestratus):

σκάρον ἐξ 'Εφέσου ζῆται, χεῖμωνι δὲ τρίγλαν
ἔσθι' ἐνί ψαφαρῇ ῥληφθέντα Τειχιόσση
Μιλήτου κώμη Καρῶν πέλας ἀγκυλοκώλων.

ληφθέντα is wrong in gender as well as in metre, but simply to alter to *ληφθεῖσαν* is not to explain the corruption. Now in 325B Athenaeus says that Archestratus praises *τὰς κατὰ Τειχιόωντα τῆς Μιλησίας τρίγλας*. It

is therefore natural to assume that the form used by Arcestratus was *Τειχιόεις* and not *Τειχιόεσσα*. It is true that Thucydides (8. 28) has *Τειχιούσσα*, and that was probably the usual name. Hence the corruption here. If Arcestratus had written

ληφθεῖσαν Τειχιόεντι,
Μιλήτου κώμη,

it is easy to understand how (especially through some fancied agreement with *κώμη*) there might be substituted

ληφθεῖσαν Τειχιόεσση.

A διορθωτής intended to correct the latter word by means of an adscript -εντι, but this was misinterpreted as an -έντα correcting *ληφθεῖσαν*. Anyone with an ear will prefer *Τειχιόεντι* in a line already sigmatic enough.

321C: After speaking of the related, but distinct, fish called *σαργαί*, *χαλκίδες*, and *σαργίνοι*, the text has:

ομοίως δὲ καὶ Δωρίων ἐν τῷ περὶ ἰχθύων φησί,
σαργίνους διὰ τοῦτ' αὐτοὺς καλῶν καὶ χαλκίδας.

This is obviously meaningless, and *διὰ τοῦτ'* has nothing whatever to which we can refer it. The most appropriate sense is that Dorion is 'peculiar' in identifying *σαργίνοι* with *χαλκίδες*. This meaning is given, not by *διὰ τοῦτ'*, but by *ἰδίᾳ τοὺς*, i.e. *σαργίνους ἰδίᾳ τοὺς αὐτοὺς καλῶν καὶ χαλκίδας*.

337E-F: Cleitarchus relates that the Thebans kept a poor and mean table *παρασκευάζοντες ἐν τοῖς δειπνοῖς θρία καὶ ἐψητοὺς καὶ ἀφύας καὶ ἐγκρασιχόλους καὶ ἀλλὰντας καὶ σχελίδας καὶ ἔπνος· οἷσι Μαρδόνιον εἰστίασε μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων πεντήκοντα Περσῶν Ἀτταγίνος ὁ Φρύωνος, ὃν φησὶν Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ ἐνάτῃ μεγάλως πλούτῳ παρασκευάσθαι· ἡγοῦμαι ὅτι οὐκ ἂν περιεγέγοντο οὐδ' ἂν ἐδέησε τοῖς Ἕλλησι περὶ Πλαταιᾶς παρατάσθαι ἀπολωλόσιν ἤδη ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων τροφῶν.*

What sense is this supposed to possess? How could Attaginus feast Mardonius 'richly' with such things? No irony is intended, for the meal actually was a sumptuous one. In any case, what has the circumstance to do with the next sentence? Kaibel adopts *ἡγοῦμαι <δ> ὅτι* from Musurus, and

his notes are (1) 'πλούτῳ del. Meineke ex Herod.,' (2) 'fort. παρασκευάσθαι.' He says nothing of the strange form *οἷσι* for *οἷς*, and offers no explanation of the appearance of *πλούτῳ*. The sense required is not *οἷσι* . . . *εἰστίασε*, but *οἷς εἰ* . . . *εἰστίασε*. It then appears that *ἡγοῦμαι* begins the apodosis, while the *δ'* of Musurus ruins the meaning. The change of *οἷς εἰ* for *οἷσι* is palaeographically no change at all. For *μεγάλως πλούτῳ* an obvious emendation is *μεγαλοπλούτως*. The only serious corruption, but one of a common type, has been the alteration of an original *ἀπολωλότας* to *ἀπολωλόσιν* to suit τοῖς Ἕλλησι through a misconception.

Read: *οἷς εἰ Μαρδόνιον εἰστίασε μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων πεντήκοντα Περσῶν Ἀτταγίνος ὁ Φρύωνος, ὃν φησὶν Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ ἐνάτῃ μεγανοπλούτως παρασκευάσθαι, ἡγοῦμαι ὅτι οὐκ ἂν περιεγέγοντο, οὐδ' ἂν ἐδέησε τοῖς Ἕλλησι παρατάσθαι ἀπολωλότας ἤδη ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων τροφῶν: i.e. "If Attaginus had feasted Mardonius and his fifty Persians with these things, I believe they would not have survived, and there would have been no occasion for them to meet the Greeks in battle, for they would already have met their death from eating such food."*

463E (from Alexis):

'We are, as it were, let out on a holiday from death into the upper air'

δὲ δ' ἂν πλείστα γελᾶσθαι καὶ πῆν
καὶ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἀντιλάβηται τὸν χρόνον
τοῦτον δὲ ἀφείται καὶ τόχῃ τ' ἐράνου τινός,
πανηγυρίσας ἥδιστ' ἀπῆλθεν οἶκαδε.

Read *τερπνοῦ* for *τ' ἐράνου*.

478D (from Aristophanes):

ἄλλαι ὑποπρεσβύτεραι γῆρας θασίῳ μέλανος μεστόν
κεραμευομέναις κοτύλαις μεγάλας φέγγοντες ἐς σφέτερον
δέμας οὐδὲν ἀκοσμον
ἔρωτι βιαζόμεναι μέλανος οἶνον ἀκράτον.

It is impossible to make any metre of this as it stands, and K. rightly remarks 'corrupti et mutili.' Madvig naturally ejected *γῆρας*, and Toup's *οὐδένα κόσμον* is clearly right. K. himself suggests . . . *μέλανος <φρένας>* . . . in the third line.

If we keep *γῥᾱες*, but alter its position, transpose *κοτύλαις* in the form *κοτύλαισι*, and read *ἔβρεχον* for *ἔγχεον*, we obtain good anapaestic lines with

ἀλλ' αἴ <θ'> ὑποπρεσβύτεραι θασίου μέλανος μεστὸν
κοτύλαισι
κεραμευόμεναις μεγάλαις ἔβρεχον σφέτερον δέμας
οὐδένα κόσμον
<χαῖ> γῥᾱες ἔρωτι βιαζόμεναι μέλανος <φρένας>
οἶνον ἀκράτου.

For *ἔβρεχον* cf. 47D. The sense of *κεραμευόμεναις μεγάλαις* is that they were 'manufactured of great size' expressly.

608D :

ἐπικατάφορος δὲ ὦν ὁ ποιητής, οὗτος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ
ἀνθη ἐν Ἀλφειοβόῳ φησίν. . . .

As everyone has seen, the context makes *καὶ* impossible. The easiest remedy is *κάρτα* (which is frequent in Athenaeus, though several times disguised by the copyists). The sentence should run :

ἐπικατάφορος δὲ ὦν ὁ ποιητής οὗτος *κάρτα* ἐπὶ
τὰ ἀνθη κ.τ.λ.

So 80D: 'Ἡγησιάνακτα . . . κατ' ἀρχὰς ὄντα πένητα καὶ τραγδὸν φησι γενέσθαι ὑποκριτικὸν καὶ εὐχον. Read ὄντ' ἀπηνῆ *κάρτα* τραγδὸν . . . And 188D: παρὰ δ' Ὀμήρῳ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Μενέλαιου συμποσίῳ προβάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις ὥσπερ ἐν διατριβῇ ζητήματα, καὶ πολιτικῶς ὁμιλοῦντες τέρπουσιν ἀλλήλους καὶ ἡμᾶς.

In point of fact, and in connection with the argument, this statement is 'clean cam.' The whole point is that Homer behaves in a manner quite unlike that of the deipnosophist Ulpian. He does *not*, like such persons, *προβάλλειν* *ζητήματα* as if at a lecture. On the contrary, his diners *ὁμιλοῦσι* *πολιτικῶς* (i.e. in a human and practical way). In 190A it is said of such a conversation in Homer οὐ γὰρ ὡς πρόβλημα προτείνει, ἀλλ' ἐπιχαρίτως παρείρας κ.τ.λ. In 186D-E Homer is the poet who teaches us to be seasonable, whereas Epicurus knows neither place nor time, so that we are led *μαντεύσασθαι* *πῶς ποτ'* ἄνθρωπος ἐξαπίνης ἔχων κύλικα *προβάλλει* *ζητήματα* *καθὰ* *περ ἐν διατριβῇ* λέγων. Here therefore read: παρὰ δ' Ὀμήρῳ ἐν τῷ τοῦ Μενέλαιου συμποσίῳ <οὐ> *προβάλλουσιν*

ἀλλήλοις ὥσπερ ἐν διατριβῇ *ζητήματα*, <ἀλλὰ> *κάρτα* πολιτικῶς κ.τ.λ.

T. G. TUCKER.

B. HORACE.

Epod. 5. 87 f.:

venena magnum fas nefasque non valent
convertere humanam vicem.

THERE is little need to discuss the renderings hitherto attempted. Nothing could be more awkward than Orelli's '*magnum fas nefasque humanam vicem non valent convertere venena*, i.e. *leges divinae, quibus distinguitur fas et nefas, more modoque hominum non valent convertere* (in contrariam, i.e. *meliolem, partem flectere ac lenire*) *venena*.' On the other hand, to take *convertere* zeugmatically, with the tortuous construction *venena magnum fas nefasque* (*valent evertere, sed non valent convertere humanam vicem* (= 'retribution') is not only to deal with Latin as Latin should not be dealt with, but also to ignore the point of *magnum* and produce a dangerously false statement.

Why should not *humanam vicem* mean 'for the sake of mankind' (= 'to please human beings')? The sense 'Potions have no power to change the mighty law of right and wrong (and its consequences) merely to suit human beings' gives full force to *magnum* and is entirely opposite to the context.

In *Epod.* 17. 42 we have *infamis Helenae Castor offensus vicem* (al. *vice*), where Orelli quotes Cic. *ad Fam.* 1. 9. 2 *nostram vicem ultus est ipse sese*. The dictionaries supply other instances. Doubtless *hominum vicem* would be more usual, but Horace would rather avoid than choose it on that account.

Sat. 1. 3. 117 ff.

I suggest that the difficulties in this well-known passage are removed if we punctuate thus—

regula, peccatis quae poenas irroget aequas,
ne scutica dignum horribili sectere flagello
(nam ut ferula caedas meritum maiora subire
verbera non vereor), cum dicas esse pares res
furta latrocinii, etc.

i.e. 'for fear you should apply the knout where only the tawse is deserved,

since you call all offences equally great.' *Aequas* of course='fair' not 'equal.' The parenthetic words should then be taken with the ordinary sense of *vereor* *ut*, viz. 'for, as for your not going so far as to use the cane on one who deserves a more severe castigation, I have no fear of *that*.' The argument is 'Let us have a rule to make the punishment fit the crime, for fear you should use the knout where the strap is sufficient (for it is on the side of severity that you are likely to err; I am not afraid of your doing so on the side of leniency). You will naturally take that more severe course when you say that petty theft is as bad as highway robbery.'

Sat. I. 6. 110 f.

hoc ego commodius quam tu, praeclare senator,
milibus atque aliis vivo.

Orelli remarks 'sane contra usum volgarem dixit *milibus aliis* pro *mille aliis*; nam *milia alia* proprie est *andre Tausende*,' not '*tausend andre*.' As it is 'contra usum,' not only 'volgarem' but any other (so far as we know), it would have been well to refrain from his rendering 'in sexcentis aliis rebus' or the alternative 'commodius quam tu et mille alii.' Professor Postgate's *milibus et quantis* is less attractive, whether technically or in sense, than most of his conjectures. I would suggest simply the alternative of *milibus* to *vilibus*, i.e. *hoc atque aliis vilibus* ('cheap things') 'commodius vivo quam tu.' Some of these '*alia vilia*' he proceeds to enumerate. [In passing it may be remarked that *praeclare senator* does not refer to Tillius, but apostrophises grandees in general.]

Od. 3. 23. 17 ff.

immunis aram si tetigit manus,
non sumptuosa blandior hostia
mollivit aversos Penates
farre pio et saliente mica.

The usual rendering, viz. 'mollivit aversos Penates farre pio et saliente mica, non blandior (futura) sumptuosa hostia (=per sumptuosam hostiam),' strikes me as needlessly harsh. Why

should not *farre pio* be simply the ablative of comparison after *blandior*? Such a hand is not, with a costly victim, more ingratiating than simple barley-meal and salt (=οὐ πολυτελεῖ ἱερεῖω ἐπαγωγότερα τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπράνεν ἢ ὅλοι καὶ ἄλες).

C. PLAUTUS, *PSEUDOLUS*.

Lorenz 402 (R. 422):

SIMO. Sed dissimulabam.

PSEUD. iam illi filius <-υ υ>:
Occisast haec res, haeret hoc
negotium.

Besides the Greek expressions actually preserved in the play there were others which, as transliterated, puzzled the copyist. The missing word here is οἴχεται, which was easily lost before *occisast*.

Lorenz 423 (R. 443):

ὦ Ζεῦ, quam pauci testis homines commodi.

I suggest 'quam pauci *es* testis homines commodi' (i.e. 'es testis quam pauci sint').

Lorenz 519 (R. 541):

quis me audacior
sit, si istuc facinus audeam? timmo sic,
Simo:
si sumus compecti seu consilium umquam
iniimus . . .
stilis me totum usque ulmeis conscribito.

Whereupon Simo is persuaded. But what is there here to persuade him? Lorenz reads *immo sic face*, admitting it to be a stopgap and achieving nothing for the sense. I believe that Pseudolus takes an oath, viz.:

ἵστω Ζεὺς, Simo.

It should be observed that one MS. has the spurious words *de istac re* after the next line. This may, of course, be a filling in of the sense, but I suspect that it is a marginal attempt to read ἵστω Ζεὺς as Latin.

T. G. TUCKER.

University of Melbourne,
Australia.

WHEN DID AGRICOLA BECOME GOVERNOR OF BRITAIN?

THE preparation of a new edition of Furneaux' *Agricola* of Tacitus (which fell to me on the death of Professor Haverfield, who had undertaken the task in the last years of his life and made some progress with it) has necessarily involved a careful reconsideration of many problems, both linguistic and historical. One of them concerns the date at which Agricola took up his command in Britain. Some observations on this matter were published sixteen years ago in the pages of this journal by Professor McElderry, who favoured the date A.D. 77 rather than the more generally accepted 78 (Vol. XVIII. p. 459 f.). If nothing of any moment depended on the exact date, the question would hardly be worth a fresh discussion outside the pages of an appendix; but in reality it has a wider bearing than would appear at first sight, and the arguments by which a conclusion may be reached have themselves some historical importance. Anything touching the career of Agricola in Britain still has, presumably, a special interest for English readers, and it is the hope of eliciting some helpful criticism from them, or from others, that has suggested the publication of this article.

The date when Agricola took over the governorship of Britain is the only important one in his whole public career about which there is now any real uncertainty. The office followed his tenure of the consulship, which (as everybody agrees) fell in A.D. 77. He was not ordinary consul but consul *suffectus*. The ordinary consuls were Vespasian and Titus, the latter retiring on January 12 in favour of his brother Domitian. Agricola was certainly not a colleague of Vespasian or Domitian, for Tacitus could not have passed over such a fact in silence. We do not know when he entered on office nor (with certainty) for how many months he held it.

About his consulship there was nothing notable to record, and Tacitus tells us nothing except that 'consul . . . filiam mihi iuveni despondit ac post

consulatum collocavit, et statim Britanniae praepositus est, adiecto pontificatus sacerdotio.' The question arises: Did Agricola take up his British command in the year of his consulship or in the following year, A.D. 78? Urlichs, who worked out (and in general correctly) the chronology of Agricola's life, decided for 78, and he has been followed by most scholars. He explained *statim* as meaning, not *statim post consulatum*, but *statim post nuptias*. Later Asbach proposed 77, and this date has been adopted by some scholars, notably Gsell (*Domitien*, p. 165, n. 2) and more recently Dessau (*Hermes*, 1911, p. 159, n. 5; with only a reference to Nipperdey, *Opuscula*, 1877, p. 524) and Gaheis (Pauly-Wissowa, X. [1917], 129). In favour of this view it is urged that (1) *statim*, which is interpreted 'immediately after his consulship,' (2) *media iam aestate transgressus* of ch. 18, implying that the assumption of office was later than usual, and (3) the *nuper* of ch. 39, referring to Domitian's triumph after the Chatti war of A.D. 83, and more naturally used of the year 84 than of 85—all point to the year 77 rather than 78. It is supposed that the consulship was held in April, May, and June, or in May and June; that is why Agricola was rather late in reaching Britain. There are other arguments, but these may be considered first.

(1) It can hardly be doubted that a strict linguistic interpretation requires *statim* to be taken as 'immediately after giving his daughter in marriage,' not as 'immediately after his consulship.' Even if Tacitus really intended the latter, *statim* might well mean no more than that Agricola passed on to his governorship without an interval of waiting.

(2) *Media iam aestas*, i.e. some time in July, does certainly seem a somewhat late date for his entry upon office, but we do not know all the circumstances. In the case of proconsular governors the beginning of July (approximately) was the normal time, at least when the province was a distant one. (Mommson indeed concluded that July 1 was fixed

as the normal date, but the evidence is that Claudius' ordinance of A.D. 43 required governors to leave Rome before April 13. *Staatsr.* II. 256). But the advocates of 77 are involved in this difficulty. The phrase *media iam aestate transgressus* (i.e. in Britanniam, supplied from the preceding words) refers to the time of Agricola's arrival in Britain,¹ not to the time of his departure from Rome (as Peter and Gudeman wrongly explain).² Even if he had left Rome on the very first day after the supposed expiry of his consulship, i.e. July 1, he would not reach the British coast before August, when *media aestas* would not be applicable. About forty days must be allowed for his journey to the coast: compare the data for the time taken by express messengers from Britain to Rome (travelling part of the way, from Marseilles, by sea) in Riepl, *Nachrichtenwesen des Altertums*, p. 204 f. On the other hand, if he crossed the Channel late in July, it is quite intelligible that by the time he had reached headquarters, taken over the command, and made his plans, the summer was over (*transvecta*, c. 18, 3): it was already September or nearly September.³

(3) *Nuper*, as Furneaux pointed out, is used in c. 32, 4 of an event which happened a year ago. Nor is it certain that Domitian's triumph took place in A.D. 83: the title 'Germanicus' dates from 84. Further, the political results of Domitian's success appear in 84 and 85, and the legend 'Germania capta' or 'de Ger(manis)' on numerous coins of 85, and 85 alone, either indicates the continuance of military operations or marks the completion of the *limes* works and the conclusion of the treaty with the Chatti, *victis partentia foedera Chattis* (Stat. III. 3, 168). In any case it is clear that Domitian's hated triumph was very much in men's minds in 85.

¹ Cp. Gerber-Greef, *Lexicon*, s.v., and ch. 15 *transisse*.

² In order to account for *quamquam transvecta aestas*, ch. 18, 3.

³ Nipperdey supposed Agricola to have 'succeeded Frontinus in Britain in July of 77,' but gave no explanation of *transvecta aestas*, nor did he state precisely when he supposed him to have held the consulship.

Next, as regards the consulship, which is supposed to have been over by the end of June. The idea of a three months' consulship beginning in April may be summarily dismissed. Such tenure occurs exceptionally in A.D. 101, but, as Mommsen long ago pointed out, 'il faut absolument écarter les consulats de trois mois que Borghesi avait admis comme phase transitoire' (*Ges. Schr.* IV, p. 426: cp. *Staatsr.* II. 86, n. 4). Nor can two-monthly consulships be proved during Vespasian's reign except for the year 71, and it would be very rash to take that year's practice as normal. It was Vespasian's first full year in Rome, when new (and not necessarily lasting) experiments might naturally be expected. After 71 the ordinary consulships appear to have been four-monthly (till the end of April) and, so far as the evidence goes, the supplementary consulships also were most probably held for four months. But if so, the theory that Agricola's governorship began in 77 falls absolutely to the ground. And even if a two-monthly term could be proved to have been common in Vespasian's reign, there is not a jot or tittle of evidence to show that Agricola did not enter on office in September or November.⁴ It is plain that in the minds of some, if not all, of the advocates of the earlier date (77) there is a dominating impression, derived from the skilful eulogy of Tacitus, that Agricola was a man of first-class importance who had been selected as governor of Britain even before his designation to the consulship, and that the necessity of holding that magistracy was the only obstacle to his immediate entry on office. For such a view there is no real foundation, though a misunderstanding of ch. 9, §§ 1 and 6, may seem to afford it. Agricola was not an exceptional, but rather a typical figure: an honest and gifted organiser and administrator, like many men in that

⁴ Nipperdey apparently thought that, even if he had been consul at the end of 77, it would have been quite natural that he should travel at once to Britain. No governor-elect would be expected to set out in winter unless there were a very grave emergency.

age, and a good engineer, but not a military genius. He was certain of promotion, but not of any exceptional promotion, and there was nothing in the situation of affairs in Britain at the time to demand a hasty transference of the higher command.

Now let us examine the remaining arguments. One advanced by Gsell carries no weight and was rightly rejected by Professor McElderry. Xiphilinus, in his confused epitome of Dio 66, 20, makes the doubtless true statement that Titus' fifteenth salutation as 'imperator' (assumed at the end of A.D. 79) was the result of a success of Agricola. Gsell infers that this must have been in the third campaign (ch. 22), since the second does not appear to have resulted in any considerable success. No reader of Tacitus would draw such a distinction, unless perhaps he had convinced himself of the truth of the wholly impossible supposition that Tanaus means the Firth of Tay. And, as fate will have it, the latest supporter of Gsell's date, Gaheis, makes this second campaign the occasion of Vespasian's twentieth acclamation. Truly, arguments based merely on imperial salutations are built on insecure and shifting foundations.

Of this character is the final argument for the earlier date. It is adduced by Gaheis (*l.c.*). Weynand had noted, as an argument against 77 and in favour of 78, that there is no new acclamation in 77, though one would be expected as the result of Agricola's first campaign, in which North Wales and Anglesey were conquered (Pauly VI. 2672); and he suggested that Vespasian's twentieth salutation (first mentioned in the first half of 79, but perhaps dating back to the end of 78 or the beginning of 79) was due to Agricola's success in this campaign, which on this ground (among others) he would place in 78. Gaheis tries to turn the argument against him. No one, he says, has hitherto taken account of the decisive statement of Tacitus, *ne laureatis quidem gesta prosecutus est*, a phrase which, indeed, he goes on to interpret in the sense that Agricola sent no report at all. The Emperor, therefore, could not have made an addition to his imperial acclamations on

the ground of this success, and so the absence of any salutation agrees perfectly with the account of Tacitus, and 77 is to be fixed as Agricola's first year. From this it would seem to be a fair inference that, if the emperor's *legati* had only been modest enough, like Agricola, or malicious enough not to affix laurels to their despatches, they might have prevented their chief from ever assuming the *nomen imperatorium* to which their victories entitled him. But in fact Tacitus adds *ipsa dissimulatione famae famam auxit*; and Gaheis' conclusion lands him in difficulties about the sixteenth and seventeenth salutations of Titus, which he has to assign to Agricola's fourth year, during which the ground overrun in the previous year was secured, and the Forth Clyde isthmus fortified, but, if we may judge from Tacitus' narrative, no important fighting took place.

Against the earlier date there are two further weighty arguments. (1) The first was briefly noted by Furneaux and concerns the 'cohors Usiporum,' whose adventures are recorded in ch. 28 and are placed by the advocates of the 77 date in A.D. 82. As Mommsen pointed out, this cohort of unwilling and untrained recruits was almost certainly enrolled as a result of Domitian's Chattan war of A.D. 83. At this time the Usipi were settled between the Sieg and the Lahn on the south of the Tencteri, whose movements they had shared and who now occupied the country opposite Cologne between the Sieg and the Ruhr on the south of the Bructeri.¹ Their ancient home between the Yssel and the Lippe had been evacuated, apparently in consequence of the campaigns of Germanicus, and since then it had formed part of the unpopulated military zone on the right bank of the lower Rhine, the *agri vacui et militum usui sepositi* which 'had formerly belonged to the Usipi' (*Ann.* 13. 54-55). No Usipi are ever afterwards heard of in these parts, and so the suggestion (*Class. Rev.* XVIII. 460) that the Usipi from whom the cohort

¹ Cp. Tac. *Germ.* 32, *Hist.* 4. 37 (with Heraeus' notes), Mommsen, *Prov.* I. p. 123. For the Tencteri, *Hist.* 4. 64.

was enlisted may have been annexed by Rutilius Gallicus during his war against the Bructeri (now datable to 78) is untenable. On the other hand, the Usipi are mentioned in *Hist.* 4. 37 as allies of the Mattiaci (round Wiesbaden) and the Chatti (in Hessen) in attacking Mainz in A.D. 69; and part of their territory lay within Domitian's *limes*. Domitian's attack was launched suddenly (*Front.* I. 1, 8, *Suet.* 6) and swiftly early in A.D. 83, and the Usipi were doubtless at once enlisted forcibly and deported in accordance with the usual Roman method of accelerating the pacification of troublesome tribes. There was ample time for them to be dispatched to Britain and to escape before the winter. If the conquest of the Usipi had no connexion with this war, it would indeed be strange that a *cohors Usiporum* should appear at this particular moment and never before nor after, and that Martial in a poem published in 90 should single out the Usipi from among anti-Roman tribes, as he does when he makes Faustinus say (VI. 60, 3):

*sic leve flavorum valeat genus Usiporum
quisquis et Ausonium non amat imperium.*

(2) In Agricola's sixth campaign (A.D. 82, if we start from 77) the Ninth legion is mentioned as being *maxime invalida*. Urlichs' suggestion that its special weakness was due to its having sent a draft to Germany for the war of 83 (as it is shown by *CIL.* xiv. 3612 to have done) has been generally accepted even by those who maintain the 77 date, except apparently Gsell, whose explanation that the legion may have had to leave a large part of its strength at York to keep an eye on the Brigantes will convince nobody. Gaheis explains

that its weakness was probably due chiefly to the losses which the campaign generally had cost (a cryptic remark which is not illuminated by an irrelevant reference to ch. 22), but he admits that the withdrawal of a detachment 'for the threatening Chattan war may have contributed to the further weakening of the legion.'¹ Urlichs' suggestion has been confirmed and amplified by an inscription found at Baalbek in 1903, which shows that all four British legions sent detachments, but that the detachment sent by the Ninth was specially large (Dessau 9200; see Ritterling, *Oesterr. Jahresh.* vii. Beiblatt, 23 ff.). It is plain that Domitian made comprehensive preparations for his Chattan war: he brought up also the twenty-first legion from Lower Germany to reinforce the four legions of Upper Germany and employed a large number of auxiliary regiments. But the fact that on September 19, A.D. 82, he disbanded a considerable number of auxiliaries serving in Upper Germany is a fairly sure indication that the war was not then in contemplation (Dessau 1995; cp. Weynand, *l.c.* 2556); and it appears wholly impossible that detachments from the four British legions should have been drafted off for this war either before or during the campaigning season of A.D. 82.

The evidence as a whole, therefore, appears to be overwhelmingly in favour of the older view that Agricola's governorship of Britain began in July, A.D. 78.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

¹ His further statement about the simultaneous withdrawal of the Legio II. Adiutrix is erroneous.

DE NIHILO.

IN C.R. XXXIV pp. 56-9 I investigated the prosody of *nihil* in Ovid and determined to some extent his principle of choice between *nihil* and *nil*. I showed that in the latter half of the first foot of the verse this word, *n(ih)il*,

NO. CCLXXIX. VOL. XXXIV.

is always¹ followed by a vowel; I said that Ovid's only imaginable motive for maintaining this restriction was to pro-

¹ Except in one verse where the sense is faulty, and to correct the sense removes the consonant.

cure a dactyl; and I concluded that in this place he always wrote *nihil*, though in 3 out of 21 examples the MSS give *nil*. I further showed that in the latter half of the second and third and fourth foot of the hexameter the word is sometimes followed by a consonant, so that in these three feet the case stands otherwise than in the first.

This was the best I could do without the guidance of Dr Postgate, which he has now vouchsafed me in *Hermathena* XLII pp. 54 sq. After reminding a forgetful world that in 1892 he quoted against Lachmann the same two instances of *nihil* which Lucian Mueller had quoted in 1861, he attempts to give the Irish an account of my investigations, but does not succeed. My observation about the invariably following vowel he omits altogether, not having grasped its significance; and he describes me as holding the opinion that to procure a dactyl instead of a spondee for the first foot was Ovid's motive for reading *nihil* with Heinsius in *met.* XIII 266, *fast.* I 445, and *Ib.* 284. This of course is not what he was trying to say, but the pen is mightier than the wrist. The statement to which in his following remarks he takes exception appears to be the statement which I really made but which he has not communicated to his readers—that Ovid's only imaginable motive for making a vowel follow the first foot in all the 21 verses which I cited was to procure for that foot a dactyl instead of a spondee. Dr Postgate observes that I adduced not only 18 instances where *nihil* precedes a vowel in the latter half of the first foot, but also 30 where it does so in the latter half of the second or third or fourth, and he proceeds

By needlessly restricting his imagination Mr Housman has failed to perceive the connexion between his two series of instances, and to divine the significance of the poet's behaviour, who was not pursuing a dactyl, but avoiding *nil*.

My imagination, I must confess, is restricted by my knowledge of facts. Ovid did not avoid *nil*: he admitted it everywhere in the first four feet except, as I have established, in the latter half of the first: in the latter half of the third foot he admitted it at least 5 times,

amor. II 1 19, *met.* VIII 440, IX 626, *fast.* III 623, *ex Pont.* III 6 9. Dr Postgate goes on to explain the connexion, which I have failed to perceive and he has succeeded in perceiving, between the 18 instances of *nihil* in the first foot and the 30 instances elsewhere. Instead of attending to the difference between Ovid's employment of *n(ih)il* in the first foot and his employment of it in the second and third and fourth—the circumstance that only in the first foot does he always contrive to let a vowel follow—I ought to have ignored it, and treated all four feet alike. I ought to have imagined, although the propensity of scribes to write *nihil* for *nil* is notorious,¹ that the spelling of the MSS is a guide in the 48 places where they give *nihil* as the latter half of the first or second or third or fourth foot; and for expelling *nil* from *met.* XIII 266 and *fast.* I 445 and *Ib.* 284 I ought to have relied not, as I did, on reasoning, but on the imposing size of this rickety regiment, as if 48 precarious examples were less precarious than one. But suppose that they were so, what then? why should the three examples of *nil* be altered? Because Dr Postgate tacitly assumes the very thing which he is trying to prove, that Ovid did not use both *nil* and *nihil* under the circumstances in question, as modern editors hold that he did.

These methods enable him to formulate the following 'Ovidian rule' in italics: '*nil may be used in the "rise" of a foot before both vowels and consonants, but in the "fall" before consonants only.*' Has Dr Postgate any news from the sick bed of our beloved sovereign Queen Anne? This opinion, as I mentioned in my paper, was apparently held by Servius in the 4th century and certainly by Heinsius in the 17th; it was held by Ovid's editors in general down to the time of Merkel, and I was taught it at school. It may be true, but it may be

¹ 'The preponderance of *nihil* in our MSS (of Phaedrus) does not really need explanation when we consider that it has ousted *nil* almost entirely from the MSS of Lucretius' says Dr Postgate on p. 58, when he has left Ovid a safe distance behind him. In Phaedrus he twelve times alters *nihil* to *nil*, in Lucretius everyone alters it scores of times.

false: it is a mere opinion, like the contrary opinion of Lucian Mueller *de r. m.* p. 296 ed. 2, 'usque ad Augusti finem potiores fuisse existimo formas breuiiores (*nil, nilum* etc.) easque restituendas ubiuis, quando metro id permittitur'; and Dr Postgate supports it by no stronger argument than announcing that he holds it. What I did was to remove from the domain of opinion the question between *nil* and *nihil* in the fall of the first foot. It is now ascertained that in this place Ovid used only *nihil*, which gave him what he liked in the first foot, a dactyl. Beyond the first foot certainty does not extend. That in the third foot, where dactyls are much less common than spondees and where *nil* in the fall is 5 times followed by a consonant, Ovid always used *nihil* instead if the following letter was a vowel, is neither ascertained nor intrinsically probable; though the preponderance (about 4 to 1) of following vowels over following consonants lends countenance to the opinion.¹

¹ In a footnote on p. 54 Dr Postgate takes occasion to say that in the *Classical Quarterly* for 1916, pp. 143 sq., I handled *ex Pont.* II 5 11 sq. with odd negligence or perversity. This means that I had the misfortune to tread on one of Dr Postgate's chickens. In the couplet

opastique breuem salui mihi Caesaris iram,
quod tamen optari si sciat ipse sinat,

I upheld the MS text against a troop of conjectures, one of which, alack, was *breui solui*. Parental affection is strong in Dr Postgate, and danger to his offspring has a tendency to discompose his thoughts. Here, by way of defending his conjecture from the charge of treasonable ambiguity which I brought against all the conjectures, he goes about to show, citing *met.* IX 273 sq., that it admits an innocent interpretation, as if that were in dispute. The task of a defender is to show that it does not admit a sinister interpretation; but this he is not calm enough to see. He even argues against himself: 'one might suppose from this'—my charge of dangerous ambiguity—'that no pentameter followed the hexameter, or that this too contained a dangerous ambiguity, as Caesar *might* approve of a prayer for his own demise.' In other and plainer words, Ovid's pentameter implies that Ovid's hexameter was innocent. Which hexameter then is the more likely to be Ovid's: that of the MSS, which is innocent, or that of Dr Postgate, which, as he does not and cannot deny, is ambiguous? When, in this troubled atmosphere, he calls my handling of the passage perverse or negligent, I am not very much

Dr Postgate's willingness to teach is great and obvious, yet I do not find him very instructive. An air of ripe and penetrating judgment is never absent from anything that he writes, but I sometimes miss the substance, and I cannot reconcile the strength of his anxiety to seem superior with the faintness of his endeavour to be so.

On pp. 56 sq. Dr Postgate proceeds to Juvenal, of whom I also spoke in *C.R.* XXXIV pp. 58 sq., and whom I have edited. Juvenal's MSS, or the best part of them, give *nihil* as the latter half of a foot with a vowel following in 15 verses. But in two verses where a vowel followed I found them favouring *nil*:

VI 58

quis tamen adfirmat *nil* actum in montibus
aut in (*nil* PFOU, *nihil* AGLT),

XV 88

sustinuit, *nil* umquam hac carne libentius
edit (*nil* PAFOT, *nihil* GLU);

and at VI 58 I wrote '*nihil* AGLT ut solet Iuuenalis in altero semipede ante uocalem; hic tamen et XV 88 Pithoceanus sequendus uidetur propter numeros, VII 54 non item.' Dr Postgate says on p. 57 'I cannot divine what are the "numeri" supporting *nil* to the overthrow of those conceded to support *nihil* "ut solet," etc.' I gather that because he cannot divine it he thinks that I was contradicting myself; and as I am sure that this suspicion cannot be agreeable to him I will try to dispel it.

These were the only two verses in Juvenal where *nil*, under the conditions described, was better² supported by the MSS than *nihil*, and in both verses the rhythm of *nihil* struck me as unfamiliar and unwelcome. I have little faith in MSS and still less in my own ear, but as they here gave the same counsel I thought there might be something in it; I made investigation, and there was.

In those verses of Juvenal which have

upset: I suppose it was less confused than could have been wished.

² Since Paris. 8072 (II or B) is now found to give *nihil* in VI 58, the support for *nil* in that verse is no longer better, but only equally good.

the normal caesura, and in which the fourth foot is a spondee consisting of a single word, the latter half of the third foot is often a monosyllable, seldom a word of pyrrhic scansion. Of the monosyllable there are 11 examples in *sat.* I alone, of the pyrrhic word there are only 12 in all Juvenal: III 134 *super illam*, 202 *ubi reddunt*, IV 60 *ubi quamquam*, VII 195 *modo primos*, VIII 47 *tamen ima*, X 154 *tamen ultra*, 155 *nisi Poeno*, 194 *ubi pandit*, 323 *habet illic*, XIII 150 *minor extat*, 216 *uelut acri*, XIV 22 *duo propter*. And 10 of the 12 are due to what may be called compulsion, for the rhythm could not be avoided by a different arrangement of the words. The two exceptions are X 155 and XIV 22, where he might have written *Poeni nisi milite* and *propter duo lintea*. Wherever else he can avoid the rhythm, he does, as in XI 122 *latos nisi sustinet*.

When the spondee of the fourth foot is composed of an elided disyllable followed by a monosyllable, there is a similar preference for a monosyllable over a pyrrhic word in the third foot—for the rhythm *nil actum in* over *nil*

actum in. The monosyllables are to the pyrrhics as 7 to 1: monosyllables III 30 *qui nigrum in*, 83, 148, 210, 216, 311, IV 14, 47, 84, VI 178, VIII 128, IX 81, X 356, XI 29, XII 60, XIII 51, XV 42, 43, 78, 166, XVI 53; pyrrhics X 112 *sine caede ac*, XI 146, XIII 221.

So much then for *nil* rather than *nihil* in the third foot of VI 58: now for the second foot of XV 88. In verses where the caesura in the third foot is procured by eliding a disyllable, and the latter half of the second foot consists of a single word, that word is a monosyllable on 10 occasions, IV 35 *res uer(a)*, 102, VI 277, 281, VII 5, 95, X 77, 284, XIII 217, XIV 206, a pyrrhic only on 3, VI 390 *stetit ant(e)*, 596, XII 24: the monosyllables therefore are more than 3 to 1. In verses where the caesura is not procured by elision the proportion of monosyllables to pyrrhics is only 3 to 2. The elision therefore made a difference, and *nil umqu(am)* is preferable to *nihil umqu(am)* in XV 88.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

NOTES

APPIAN, CIVIL WARS, I. CH. 14.

ὁ δὲ (Γράχχος) . . . συνεκάλει τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν ἐπὶ τὴν χειροτονίαν, ἀσχολουμένων δ' ἐκείνων ὡς ἐν θέρει . . . ἐπὶ τὸν ἐν τῷ ἄστει ὄημον κατέφευγε.

THIS passage, relating to the tribunician elections of 133 B.C. in which Tiberius Gracchus lost his life, raises a difficulty. Who were οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν?

Evidently not the general body of landholders on the *ager Romanus*.¹ These had been in possession of their land before Tiberius' land act had ever been heard of, and as this act concerned

none but landless men,² they derived no benefit from it. Tiberius had no claim on their support, and it is incredible that he should have expected them to throw up their work during the busy season in order to support him at the hustings.

Tiberius' appeal can only have been addressed to those who had been benefited, or expected to benefit, under his land act. But in the summer of

¹ So apparently Greenidge (*History of Rome*, p. 136), who describes τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν simply as 'farmers,' and Ihne (*History of Rome*, English translation, IV. p. 404), who calls them 'peasants.'

² This is evident from the provisions of Tiberius' law, and especially from the language which he held during his propaganda: 'τοῖς δ' ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἰταλίας μαχομένοις καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἀερός καὶ φῶτος, ἄλλου δὲ οὐδέενος, μέτεστιν, ἀλλ' ἅοικοι καὶ ἀνδρῶν μετὰ τέκνων πλανῶνται καὶ γυναικῶν . . . ἀποθνήσκουσι κύριοι τῆς οἰκουμένης εἶναι λεγόμενοι, μίαν δὲ βῶλον ἰδὲ τὰν οὐκ ἔχοντες' (Plutarch, *Tib. Gracchus*, ch. ix.).

133 B.C. the great majority of these must still have been waiting for their land. No doubt Tiberius lost no time in introducing his land bill. But this measure was obstructed so persistently that eventually it had to be withdrawn and replaced by a fresh proposal. The second bill, moreover, encountered similar opposition before it could be made into law; and its execution was delayed by financial difficulties and by a never-ending series of lawsuits which finally brought the land distribution to a dead stop. Under these conditions it is most unlikely that any considerable number of Tiberius' supporters had taken up their allotments at the time of the tribunician elections.

What, then, were the landless majority of Tiberius' party doing on the countryside? The answer which I suggest is that *they had hired themselves out as wage earners* during the busy part of the agricultural season. The presence of such wage earners on Italian farms is often overlooked owing to the prevalence of slave cultivation on the larger estates. Yet the existence of servile labour enhanced rather than diminished the importance of the hired labourer as on occasional helpmeet. In order to avoid having idle capital on their hands during the slack season, the large Roman landowners naturally reduced their permanent staff to such numbers as they could keep employed all the year round. But this permanent staff would not be nearly sufficient to cope with the work of the busy season. On olive plantations the labour required at picking time was fourfold the ordinary amount.¹ Hence it was a regular custom for landlords to put out the whole of the picking on contract to an *entrepreneur* with a staff of free labourers, or even to sell off the harvest to him while it hung on the trees.² A similar practice obtained in the vineyards³ and on the hay-meadows.⁴ On corn land

the assistance of hired labour was even more essential; on some estates the entire work of the summer season was made over to a *politor* to 'polish off' on a basis of payment by shares.⁵ A supply of occasional hired labour was therefore considered indispensable to the profitable working of a large estate.⁶

It cannot be ascertained from what sources these casual labourers were usually recruited. But occasional mention is made of disbanded soldiers—the class whom Tiberius especially befriended in his land act—eking out their subsistence by harvest work.⁷ We may therefore conjecture that Tiberius' supporters, pending the receipt of an allotment of their own, went out to the countryside as wage earners during the busy season,⁸ and that this temporary engagement on the land was the reason of their leaving Tiberius in the lurch.

M. CARY.

HERO AND LEANDER.

1-6 Εἰπὲ θεά, κρυφίαν ἐπιμάρτυρα λύχρον ἐρώ-
των . . . (1)
νηχόμενον τε Λεάνδρον ὁμοῦ καὶ λύχρον ἀκούω, (5)
λύχρον ἀπαγγέλλοντα διακτοριῇ Ἀφροδίτης.

ἀκούω is strange: after addressing the Muse the writer would hardly say 'I hear L. swimming,' etc. Should we not read *ἀγωγόν* = 'guiding-light'?

31-2 Κύπριδος ἦν ἱέρεια, γάμων δ' ἀδίδακτος εὐδαι-
τύργον ἀπὸ προγόνων παρὰ γέλτονι ναίε θαλάσση.

Should we not read *ἀποπρὸ γονέων*, the latter being a dissyllable?

⁵ Cato 4, § 4, ch. 136. The *politor* received one-fifth to one ninth of the produce. On this basis of remuneration it cannot be supposed that the *politor* prepared and sowed the land. But the reaping and threshing of the corn would require a considerable expenditure of labour, for in ancient Italy this work was done with very inefficient instruments, such as hand-sickles and threshing-sledges.

⁶ Ca. 1, § 3.

⁷ Xenophon, *Hellenica*, II. 1. 1.; VI. 2. 37. These instances are drawn from Greek history, but are none the less applicable to the present case.

⁸ Diodorus (Bk. 34, fr. 6.) describes Tiberius' supporters as *πλήθος πρακτικώτατον τοῦ δήμου καὶ τοῖς βίοις κάρπιμον*. This would be an apt description of demobilised men who did not merely rely on state bounties, but went out in search of work.

¹ Cato, *De Re Rustica*, chs. 144-5.

² *Ibid.* ch. 146. Among these *entrepreneurs* may be reckoned the great-grandfather of the Emperor Vespasian, who used to conduct gangs of harvesters from the Umbrian mountains into the Sabine country (Suetonius, *Vespasianus*, 1. § 4).

³ *Ibid.* ch. 147.

⁴ Varro, *De Re Rustica*, I. 17. 2-3.

80-1 οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ κατ' Ὀλυμπον ἐφιεῖρω θεὸς εἶναι
ἡμετέρην παρὰκοῖτιν ἔχων ἐν δώμασιν Ἥρω.

ἐγὼ in the preceding line makes ἡμετέρην difficult enough, but the fact that these are the words of many stranger suitors condemns the word altogether. We may read *θηλυτέρην* (L. and S. II. 2). The similarity of H and Θ would explain the error.

245-7 Δεινὸς Ἔρως, καὶ πόντος ἀμείλιχος· ἀλλὰ θαλάσσης
ἐστὶν ὕδωρ, τὸ δ' Ἐρωτος ἐμὲ φλέγει ἐνδύμνον
πῦρ.
Λάξεο πῦρ, κραδίη, μὴ δεῖδιθι νήχυντον ὕδωρ.

I.e. "Λάξεο = 'dread the fire (of Love), not the water of the sea.'

256-7 Ἥρω δ', ἡλιβάτοιο φασφόρος ὑψόθι πύργου
λευγαλὲς αἰρῆσιν ὅθεν πνεύσειεν ἀήτης
φάρει πολλάκι λύχρον ἐπέσκιν.

I.e. ὅτ' ἐμπνεύσειεν, 'whenever it blew.'

284-5 νήχετο δ' ἀντιπύριοι πάλιν ποτὶ δῆμον Ἀβύδου
ἐννυχίον ἀκόρητος ἔτι πνεῖον ὕμεναίων.

I.e. ἔτ' εὐναίων ὕ.

325 (326) καὶ σθένος ἦν ἀδόντηον ἀκοιμήτων παλαμάων.

I.e. ἀνόνητον. The last twenty lines all emphasise the uselessness of human effort, and are a masterpiece.

T. W. LUMB.

Merchant Taylors' School,
E.C.

AENEID XI. 309.

As printed in modern editions of Virgil, ll. 305-9 run as follows:

Bellum importunum, cives, cum gente deorum
invictisque viris gerimus, quos nulla fatigant
proelia nec victi possunt absistere ferro.
spem si quam ascitis Aetolum habuistis in armis,
ponite. spes sibi quisque; sed haec quam
angusta videtis.

The metrical anomaly in 309 is notorious. It is quite unexampled in Virgil's authenticated poems, though it may derive some faint support from *Culex* 194, *horrida squamosi volventia terga draconis*. Dawes, when he laid down his Canon, proposed a violent alteration of text in order to remove it; and Burgess cut the knot by supposing that Virgil had stopped at *ponite*, and that the rest of the line was a spurious stop-gap. This drastic remedy was favourably regarded by Heyne, who however argued that the stop after *ponite* made the anomalous scansion

easier. In this suggestion he has been followed by other editors; it is, to my mind, simply absurd.

But the matter is further complicated by the uncertainty as to the punctuation, and the consequent meaning, of the passage. On this, Heyne's note is: *veteres grammatici, Servius, Donatus, Priscianus, Marcianus Capella distinxerunt ponite spes sibi quisque . . . sed melior interpunctio iam antiquitus obtinuit, nec aliter Apronianus instituit*. Servius here is a misprint for *Servius*; otherwise the note, though incomplete, appears to be correct. The full references will be found in Ribbeck *ad l.* That the *melior interpunctio* (if it be in fact such) was the tradition of the early commentators, is clear from the Servian note 'spes sibi quisque *subaudis* sit,' as well as from the further note in Serv. Dan., 'ponite *deponite*.' Those who put the stop at the end of l. 308 must have attached 308 to 305-7, with only a comma at the end of 307; and there could be no objection to that on the ground of sense, or of grammar, or of rhythm.

It might further be argued that *spem ponite* would, according to common Latin and common Virgilian usage, naturally mean 'place your hope' not 'lay aside your hope,' as in the familiar *spem ponis in armis*, *Aen.* II. 676 and XI. 411. But there is not much in this. *Pono* is more frequently used by Virgil than *depono*; and very often no distinction of meaning can be made between the two: (cf. *depono* in *Ecl.* III. 31, with *ponam*, in exactly the same sense, four lines lower down). There are at least ten or twelve passages in which *ponere* might equally well bear either meaning (e.g. *Georg.* IV. 238, *Aen.* VI. 611 etc.); and that Virgil felt no uneasiness about using *ponere* to express both of two opposite meanings is clear from comparison, for instance, of *nomen posuisse colonis*, *Aen.* VII. 63, with *nomen posuit Saturnia tellus*, *Aen.* VIII. 329. In the passage before us, the use of *habuistis* instead of *posuistis*, though of course it is partly at least for metrical convenience, suggests that Virgil was keeping the ground clear for his *ponite* (in the other sense) in the next line.

But if we point after *ponite*, the words

spes sibi quisque are left curiously in the air, and do not sound quite Virgilian. Whether we supply *sit* (with Servius), or *est* (with some modern editors), the phrase is a little strained and over-rhetorical. Deuticke cites Quintilian, Decl. 12, *sibi quisque cura est*, in support; but the sententiousness of the phrase is like Seneca rather than Virgil. It would be more natural if *spes* were taken as an accusative plural, though the ellipsis, of some such verb as *figit* or *figat*, would be somewhat violent. Cf. *Aen.* X. 107, *quam quisque secat spem*.

What suggests itself as probable is that this is one of the unfinished passages (of which there are several in the later books of the *Aeneid*), in which Virgil had started a sentence, broke it off, and started again, leaving what he had first written un erased, and perhaps intending to work the two together: that he wrote

spem si quam ascitis Aetolum habuistis in armis
ponite

—that he was dissatisfied with this, possibly (though this is a mere conjecture on which no stress can be laid) because of the ambiguity discussed above, and that he then began afresh

ponit spes sibi quisque; sed haec quam angusta videtis.

If it stood so in the MS. which was before his editors, it would be natural for them to suppose that *ponite ponit* was a mere dittography, to strike out *ponit*, and to publish the text as it has come down to us. There is no record or trace of any difference of text as apart from the differences in its punctuation. Something of the same kind seems to have happened in *Aen.* VII. 543, as noted in the *Classical Review* for 1915, p. 229.

J. W. M.

ALAPARI.

EVERYONE who lectures on Plautus knows that Ritschl made great use of Placidus' Glossary and ought to know that, since Ritschl's time, the glossary has been presented in its true form by Goetz (in vol. v. of the *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*); also that

only a part (the 'shorter glosses' or, better, the 'pseudo-Placidus' glosses') are useful for the text of Plautus (see *Journ. Phil.* 34, 255 ff. for details). Now the gloss *alapari* does not belong to this part. It comes from notes of Placidus' lectures, not from marginalia culled (probably not by Placidus) from copies of Republican authors. Placidus, discussing in a lecture the word (employed by Christian writers) *alapari*, 'to boast,' derived it from *alapa*, 'a box on the ear,' and suggested (a mere guess) that it may have meant originally 'alapas minari.' Buecheler, before the true nature of Placidus' glossary was known, took this guess of Placidus too seriously and found a place for the supposed *alapari* 'alapas minari' in a trochaic line of the *Truculentus* (928), where Spengel's emendation is most probable:

Philippiari satiust, miles, si te amari postulas
'you must pay Philippi, golden Philippi-coins' ('nil alapari,' Buecheler).

The whole article in the *Thesaurus* should be rewritten.

By the way, what of the *Thesaurus*? Is that great work to stop, through financial difficulties? That would be a world-calamity. Surely English Latinists will come to the rescue.

W. M. LINDSAY.

The University,
St. Andrews.

PUNCTUATION OF LIVY XXVII.

CH. XL. § 10.

Priusquam Claudius consul in prouinciam
perueniret,

per extremum finem agri

{ Larinatis (MSS.
reading)
Uriatis (Madvig's
alteration)

ducentem in Sallentinos exercitum Hannibalem
expeditis cohortibus adortus C. Hostilius Tu-
bulus
incomposito agmini terribilem tumultum in-
tulit.

C. CLAUDIUS NERO was now, 207 B.C.,
taking command against Hannibal
(ch. xxxv. § 10).

Hannibal had his main headquarters
'in Bruttiiis,' and from there he had

moved on Tarentum (*cf.* ch. xl. § 12), as had been apprehended by the late consul Crispinus (ch. xxix. § 3).

Hostilius Tubulus was still at Tarentum; his transference to Capua had been decided on (ch. xxxv. § 14), but was not carried out until after the attack on Hannibal here mentioned (*cf.* ch. xl. § 13).

It follows that—

- (1) Hannibal could not have been leading his army 'per extremum finem agri Larinatis in Sallentinis'—*i.e.* through a district in N. Apulia to a district in W. Calabria.
- (2) Hostilius Tubulus could not have attacked him in N. Apulia.

This is the difficulty in the reading 'Larinatis,' of all MSS.

But the suggestion of 'Uriatis' for 'Larinatis' is unconvincing and not satisfactory, considering the relative positions of Hannibal and Hostilius Tubulus.

A re-punctuation, connecting the words 'per . . . Larinatis' not with 'ducentem . . . Hannibalem,' but with 'Priusquam . . . perueniret' would seem to lessen the difficulty. 'Before Claudius reached his provincia, going by way of the borders of Larinum, Hostilius attacked Hannibal.'

But Claudius Nero was going from Rome, first to Venusia, to take over his army (ch. xxxv. § 12, xxxviii. § 8, xl. § 14), and then to his provincia, and Larinum was quite away from the direct route: why should he go to Larinum?

From ch. xliii. § 10, it appears that when he went north to join Livius against Hasdrubal he did go 'per agrum Larinatem': may he not have already foreseen and even planned his action in support of Livius? And may he not have chosen to go now and take observations of the district and people through which he would later have to pass?

Larinum was accessible by good roads from Rome; and though there was no main road from Larinum to Venusia, minor roads or even tracks would be possible for Nero, travelling light and with no army.

The position of the words 'per . . . agri Larinatis' is the right one for this

interpretation; they are an addition, implying that, and explaining why, Nero was longer than might be expected in reaching his provincia—and so the occasion arose for Hostilius' attack on Hannibal. The mention of Nero's détour is thus relevant. But any statement of the motive of it would be irrelevant, and would indeed both interrupt and forestall the narrative, and spoil the dramatic effect of Nero's apparently unprecedented action in marching north to join Livius, as related in its proper place (ch. xl. iii. and following chapters).

S. M. M. FURNESS.

Bedford College,
London.

ON THE LATIN PENTAMETER.

THERE are five types of trisyllabic endings found in Latin pentameters before Ovid: A, e gremio,¹ B, gemens Ityli, C, luminibus Venerem, D, aliquid sceleris, E, amicum habuit.

	A	B	C	D	E
Catullus ...	45	19	14	4	2
Tibullus, etc.	6	19	3	0	0
Propertius ...	24	25	1	0	0

It is obvious why D and E are almost entirely forbidden and why C declined with such rapidity. The variations in A and B may be ascribed to the idiosyncracies, perhaps unconscious, of the poets; my own ear inclines to agree with Tibullus. The true poetry of the Roman elegiac perished on the pyre of Cynthia, but it is worth while to contemplate the figures of Martial: A 119, B 8, C 2, D 6. Ausonius is as promiscuous as might be expected.

There is more, I believe, in Dr. Atkinson's theory of the liquid in the trisyllable than most people are willing to allow. Some poets particularly affect liquids in seeking their musical effects; this is very visible in Spenser. 'Gradius' is for me a vastly superior ending as compared with 'pedibus.'

ARTHUR PLATT.

¹ The monosyllable in this type is occasionally an elided trochee in Catullus and Martial.

REVIEWS

ALLEN AND FLICKINGER ON THE GREEK THEATRE.

The Greek Theater of the Fifth Century before Christ. By JAMES TURNER ALLEN (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. VII.) 1918.

The Greek Theater and its Drama. By ROY C. FLICKINGER, Ph.D., Professor of Greek and Latin North-Western University. (University of Chicago Press.) 18s. net. 1918.

IN no department of classical study has American scholarship done more valuable work of recent years than in the study of the Greek drama and its settings. Now Professor Allen has given us an interesting brochure; Professor Flickinger, a pupil of Professor Capps, who has himself written so much on the subject, has given us a learned and important book. He has three qualifications for the task: he has been to Athens, and knows thoroughly the archæological data; he has carefully studied the extant plays; he has an intelligent interest in the modern drama, and quotes freely from modern writers to illustrate dramatic technique. The only weakness of the book is that it is too comprehensive a subject for one volume. He includes nearly all the matter in Haigh's two well-known works, and a good deal besides. This makes necessary a brief and somewhat dogmatic treatment of highly controversial points, particularly as he has in view the general reader as well as the classical student. One misses often the citation of authorities, where they would have been welcome. One always knows exactly, not only what Haigh thinks, but why; the foundations of Professor Flickinger's statements are sometimes desiderated, when one wishes to weigh them, but within the limits he imposed on himself this was inevitable. The subject teems with difficulty, and it is very hard to distinguish between fact and hypothesis more or less plausible, but unverified and perhaps unverifiable.

In the Introduction he gives his views of the origins. Brushing aside Ridgway's theory as 'a doctrine of ultimate derivation which loses itself in primeval darkness,' he regards Arion during his stay at Corinth, and Epigenes of Sicyon as the real founders of tragedy. Arion called his performances 'dramas' (*teste* Solon), and gave the dithyramb a regular literary form. The performers were the regular Peloponnesian caprine satyrs. But the name *τραγῳδία* came from Sicyon, not Corinth (Hdt. V. 97), and the choreutae there were not caprine either before or after Dionysus superseded Adrastus as the divinity honoured. With the transfer to Dionysus the goat became the prize, and was consumed in a sacrificial feast. Hence the terms *τραγικοί χοροί* and *τραγῳδοί* (though they may have existed in the Adrastus period). In Attica dances of mummers with equine attributes (*Sileni*) were immemorial. Thespis at Icaria partly borrowed Peloponnesian features such as metre, the goat prize, the absence of improvisation, and the terms *δῶμα* and *τραγῳδός*, partly introduced his own ideas, the chief of which was the one actor. Pratinas later introduced the combination of the dithyramb of Phlius with Attic tragedy, which crystallised as the satyr-play, but did not adopt the Dorian goat-type: the native Silenus type, except for the goatskin about the loins, remained permanent. Professor Flickinger does not, however, make clear what view he takes of the goat-satyrs on the British Museum Pandora vase: Reisch is probably right in referring them to some comedy such as Eupolis' *Αἴγες*.

As to comedy, the phallic *comus* was indigenous to Attica, and Attic vases of about 500 B.C. represent such revellers as cocks and birds, and as riding on horses, dolphins, and ostriches; the *comus* always contained a semi-histrionic agon. Megara influenced the development, but Crates was the first to invent plot sequence.

That part of the Introduction which deals with the fabric is of course largely concerned with the venerable stage controversy. Professor Flickinger has really done more to eliminate the Greek stage by his clever analyses of extant plays than by his treatment of the actual remains. Thus his diagram and description of *Frogs* 1-460, have really convinced me after long hesitation that there can have been nothing even of the height of the Roman stage in the fifth century theatre at Athens. His treatment of the evidence is however, as is the case with everybody who writes on the subject, somewhat hypothetical. He really convinces me that *σκηνή* never meant 'stage' in our sense of the word. But I am unable after reading him any more than before to feel sure what Vitruvius meant by *theatrum Graecorum*: I regard his treatment of *ἀναβαλνῆν* and *καταβαλνῆν* as unsatisfactory: I think that it is very curious to sever the word *λογεῖον* from public speakers altogether (see p. 59, n. 1), and I cannot feel absolutely certain about his explanation of Pollux IV. § 127. The latter, however, which is independent of Dörpfeld, is extremely ingenious and attractive. Pollux had the theatre of Athens as reconstructed in the time of Nero exclusively in his mind. But in that reconstruction the front of the stage was not brought forward so far as in the later reconstruction by Phaedrus: the *parodoi* still led into the orchestra, and so *διὰ κλιμάκων* means by the permanent steps connecting orchestra and stage. Pollux's *hyposcenium* is therefore beneath the stage (*λογεῖον*), and was decorated with the same frieze which we now see mutilated and set up on the later stage of Phaedrus. This is supported by an ingenious treatment of Plutarch, *Demetrius*, c. 34. Plutarch pictured the scene as it would have been in his own day, much as St. Luke describes the house in which the Gospel miracle was performed as a Western rather than Eastern house (v. 19, contrast St. Mark ii. 4).

To continue the summary of Professor Flickinger's views, there was no background at all behind the old orchestra-ring till 465 B.C. Ingenious observations about the performance

of *Prometheus Vincit* may be found on p. 228; but why make much of the rude structure at Thoricus? In 465 B.C. a wooden scene-building was set up behind the orchestra, where the declivity had been, or in the south half of the old orchestra in case the orchestra was moved fifty feet nearer the Acropolis at this time. It was of wood, of a single story, and had '*neither parascenia nor a columned proscenium*.' But Professor Allen, in his work on the *Fifth-Century Theatre*, has made it highly probable that the first scene-building had *parascenia* and was erected upon the southern part of the old orchestra, and with great cogency utilises the foundations marked D on Dörpfeld's plan (Fig. 14) in this connexion as part of the supporting wall of the western *parodos*. Professor Flickinger says that if Aristotle and Vitruvius deserve credence as to the introduction of scene-painting, such scenery 'must have been attached directly to the scene-building itself, and not inserted between the intercolumniations of the *proscenium* columns.' Professor Allen, however, insists that there were columns in the fifth century. Now we know nothing positively about the appearance of the back wall between the *paraskenia* in the Lycurgen theatre. We can say for certain that in it the *paraskenia* each had in front six columns and a Doric frieze, the total height being thirteen feet. All else is conjecture. I cannot understand how any scholar can show the great variety of scene required by the extant plays, as Professor Allen does (p. 43 ff.), and then produce a restoration like that on Fig. 31.

Professor Flickinger goes on to say that about 430 B.C. (if I am right) the scene-building rose to a second story. [I think Professor Allen perfectly right in arguing (p. 63) that the *Psychostasia* of Aeschylus (before 458 B.C.) requires a second story.] The crane, or *μηχανή*, was introduced (this seems likely enough), and 'a wooden *proscenium*, capable of receiving painted panels according to the nature of the play was built between the *paraskenia* far enough forward to allow of a quasi-interior porch or portico: he does not give any approval to the *πρόθυρον*

theory, as Dörpfeld holds it, and Professor Allen also discounts the evidence of S. Italian vases. 'The floor of this porch or portico was probably raised a step or two above the orchestra level' and this is the explanation of ἀναβαλννν and καταβαλννν in Aristophanes. Professor Allen, however, a more thoroughgoing Dörpfeldian, will not hear of any difference in level, and follows J. W. White in regarding the words as conventional for coming on and off in these passages, and καταβαλννν as = *in certamen descendere* in *Wasps* 1514. This is probably right. I cannot, however, follow Professor Allen in explaining *Ion* 725, *Electra* (Eur.) 489, by the fact that the parodi sloped upwards to the old orchestra. As so played the scenes would have been invisible to most of the audience: the fact seems to be that, as Professor Allen himself says (p. 45), much in the Greek drama was left to the imagination.¹ With the latter part of Professor Allen's work, and his treatment of the προσκήνιον as the Aeschylean σκηνή, I am quite unable to agree. The difficulties of scholars largely arise from endeavouring to read the Hellenistic προσκήνιον into the fifth century. All these decorated column panels were built at a time when the drama was no longer vigorous. Hardly any of them, with the possible exception of Epidauros, need be earlier than the third century: most are later. They were approached by inclined planes from either end, and those climbing up to them came gradually into view of the audience. They were not, I cannot help thinking, primarily designed for the actors' use, but for individual performers, musicians, and the like, and certainly for public speakers. I cannot think that they were under the actors' feet, but I doubt if they were designed at all with reference to the drama. Of course there must have been something of the

nature of a permanent *proskēnion* in the fourth century, but even then the upper structure, which seems to be correctly described as *episkēnion*, may have been of wood. The one solid fact we have to go on, is that in the Lyrurgian theatre there was a solid *frons scaenae* with projecting *paraskēnia*; and Professor Allen has now made it highly probable that the earliest building was on similar lines. If the Hellenistic age moved forward the *frons scaenae* and curtailed the *paraskēnia* at Athens and elsewhere, it is impossible to suppose with Professor Allen that the same thing happened two centuries before. It is probable that we shall never know exactly before what kind of background a play of Sophocles was acted. Personally, if I have to state my view, I prefer the theory that the *skēnē* wall was painted to represent a house or anything else that was supposed to be the background. But notwithstanding all that has been said against the *scaena ductilis*, I should regard it as quite a possible suggestion.

Both scholars, following Mr. Exon, are interesting and sound on the *eccyclema*: Professor Norwood's recent views can be compared with theirs. Many of Professor Flickinger's explanations of dramatic technique are so good that they deserve quoting, did space allow. He is very sound on the three-actor rule and on the treatment by the tragedians of the *chorus*. He shows in a very interesting way how the *Supplikes* of Aeschylus might be made a one-actor play by little alteration. Of his quotations from modern writers, Mr. Gordon Craig's dictum about masks (p. 224), and Professor Lounsbury's remarks on the unities (p. 264), particularly deserve mention. The whole book is an admirable and judicious treatment of a very complicated subject, and Professor Allen's work is an interesting addendum to it. I hope it will be forgiven me that I have treated both together, but it seemed impossible to separate them.

G. C. RICHARDS.

¹ It is a mistake of Homolle to suppose that a pediment was described by Euripides in the *Ion* (Allen, p. 45). See Dr. F. Poulsen's *Delphi*. (Eng. tr., p. 157, n. 1.)

ORIGIN AND MEANING OF APPLE CULTS.

Origin and Meaning of Apple Cults. By J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., D.Litt., D.Theol., etc. Pp. 50. (Reprinted from 'The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,' Vol. V., Nos. 1 and 2, August, 1918-March, 1919.) Manchester: At the University Press; Longmans, Green and Co., 1919.

THIS interesting little brochure is as good an example as we have seen of the gentle art of making facts fit theories. Dr. Rendal Harris is interested to prove that Apollo is 'the personification of the healing virtue and solar attributes of the mistletoe, and particularly of the mistletoe as it is found growing upon the apple-tree; and that the apple and its mistletoe are his original sacred symbols' (p. 5). This task he attempts as follows:

Apple cults, familiar in England under the form of yuling or howling the apple-trees, are ancient and important, owing to the ancients' of apple-growing (Chap. I.). Now in some of these cults, or rituals, we find a boy sent up the tree, whose business it is to pretend to be a tom-tit, and to chirp and call for food; a request which is met with an offering of bread and cheese and cider. Also, the tree is struck, fired at, and in other ways attacked. We have therefore a tree-spirit in bodily form, who is probably killed and certainly supposed to be a bird, and so may be connected with the wren and her supposed mate, Cock Robin. But these are thunder-birds, so the road to a high divinity lies open. Now on Greek soil we have in the well-known coins of Crete (1) a girl, conventionally called Europa or Britomartis, sitting on a tree and visited by an eagle; (2) a boy (? Zeus) *Feλxavός*, also in a tree (Chap. II.). Also, we have in England the tree itself personified, in the ancient ditty:

Old Robin is dead and in his grave,
There grew an old apple-tree over his head.

(We may omit Dr. Harris' emphasis on the name Robin, as that is not a constant element. In the version of the song heard by the reviewer some thirty

years ago in Ontario, the name is 'Grummle'—i.e., presumably, Cromwell). We have also in connexion with the wren a king and queen whose business it is to eat him, and much killing of robins and other birds in connexion with sacred legends. Now in Crete again we find, not only a boy, named or unnamed, but Apollo himself, recognisable by his attributes, sitting on a tree. Hence 'Apollo in Crete in the fourth century B.C. was a tree-boy' (p. 35). Moreover, in one of the wren-ceremonials, that of the Isle of Man, we have a fortune-telling fiddler, exactly the sort of person out of whom an Apollo might develop (Chap. III.). Lastly, we have a tree-bird-boy, with a girl for his partner, in Ganymedes and Hebe, of whom the former is often shown giving drink—doubtless nectar—to the eagle, with the oak-tree somewhere at hand. This is significant, in connexion with the fact that the apple-tree we started from is watered with cider, and that we may suppose that the eagle-oak-Zeus is given to drink of an ivy-brew, which is connected with Hebe (Chap. IV.). Finally, there are reasons for connecting Baldur, no very distant kinsman of the northerner Apollo, with an apple-tree (Chap. V.).

To criticise this combination, which we have tried to present as fairly as possible, in adequate detail, would involve writing a longer treatise than the modest-sized work we are reviewing. We only point out a few weak links in the chain, setting aside all mention of the obvious connexion of the argument with certain ingenious ideas of Mr. A. B. Cook, which we regard as hazardous in the extreme. Granted that a ritual—magic, sacramental, or what you will—in connexion with the apple-tree has developed or "projected" a tree-spirit in visible form; that spirit is supposed to be a tom-tit, and to identify that bird with either wren or robin is as unsafe in mythology as in ornithology. Suppose, further, that the same process took place in Crete. Crete is not Greece, nor are the trees on the Cretan coins apple-trees.

Setting this aside, why should every deity who is shown sitting in a tree be a tree-spirit? One thinks, quite as naturally, since all the representations are relatively late, of the tree considered as a natural throne for any god because a tree-god sits in it; of Indian trees, which hold all manner of *nats* in their haunted branches; of the artist using a tree as a sort of shorthand for a sacred grove. As the apple-tree and its supposed representatives are supposedly sacrificed in some way, sacramental or other, some scrap of tradition about similar experiences of Apollo would be in place; but he is even more unpromisingly immortal than the non-

Cretan Zeus. Philologically also, in view of the very wide meaning of *μῆλον* and its cognates, we would like more evidence that the sacred 'apple-tree' which Dr. Harris finds here and there in Greece was our apple-tree or anything like it. Finally, if all these links would hold, how came this apple-god to be worshipped as Lykeios and Nomios? What have shepherds and the wolves that prey upon their flocks, or the bow and arrows which guard them, to do with the orchard?

H. J. ROSE.

University College,
Aberystwyth.

SENECA.

Seneca. By FRANCIS HOLLAND. Crown 8vo. Pp. viii + 206. With Frontispiece. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920. 10s. 6d. net.

MR. HOLLAND'S book makes a more direct appeal to the general reader than to the classical scholar. The latter will probably feel that for his purpose it is not sufficiently documented, and that it does not take sufficient cognisance of some problems concerned with Seneca's personality and works. But then this was not the author's aim: originally intended to form the introduction to a translation of Seneca's letters, this essay in biography has now been printed by itself, the author explains, 'on the chance that here and there some reader may be found to share my interest in the subject.' To the general reader the book presents an attractively written account of Seneca in relation to his age and the three Emperors, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero. Much is made to live again in Mr. Holland's bright style, and in the apposite translations of passages quoted, in the main, from Seneca himself.

At the same time, while the general reader may be spared minutiae of detail, he ought to expect accuracy in such details as are given. For instance, he would be misled by the mention on the very first page of the elder Seneca's 'five books of *Controversiae*,' when

there were really ten, as he would discover if he tried to verify the reference on p. 10 to the elder Seneca's weariness of his rhetorical reminiscences 'in the preface of the last book.' Nor would the unsuspecting general reader guess that the explicit statement on p. 36 that Seneca wrote 'after an interval of six months from his arrival [in Corsica] the *Consolation* to his mother' is, as far as date goes, a gratuitous piece of information based on no exact evidence, but touching a disputed point. According as the reader remembers his classics or not, he might or might not wonder whether Messalina's mock marriage at Silius' 'urgent entreaty' (p. 46), which, I take it, Mr. Holland bases on Tacitus' *Annals*, XI. 26, squares with Juvenal's suggestion, in the tenth satire, that Silius had a kind of 'Hobson's choice' in obeying the Empress's imperious will respecting the ceremony. Both accounts might be alluded to for the sake of completeness. The words ascribed to Horace on p. 44,

*video meliora proboque,
deteriora sequor,*

come from Medea's soliloquy in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.

The principles in giving references are sometimes puzzling to follow. The quotation from Seneca on p. 36, *deprecatus est pro me senatum*, which Mr. Holland cites as from *Ad Polybium* xxxvii., will be found in most editions

at xiii. 2, while his quotation on p. 40, *tenacissima memoria retulit*, from a later part of the same treatise (xiv. 1), apparently occurs earlier according to the reckoning given, xxxiii. On p. 25, the footnote reference to *Ad Heluiam* should be to xviii., not xvi.; and on p. 7, footnote, the wrong chapter, xvi., is given instead of xvii., and the Latin misquoted with *nimis* for *minus*. On p. 176, '*De Beneficiis*, 717,' is an impossible reference.

One of the chief merits of the book lies in its keen and catching sympathy for its subject, and in its vivid glimpses of the imperial court at Rome. It does not propound fresh problems, and in fact passes over entirely or quite lightly many vexed questions. We might have looked for some such discussion of the cause of Seneca's banishment as is given in the introduction to M. Favez's recent edition of the *Consolatio ad Heluiam*, because the question of Seneca's alleged adultery with Julia vitally concerns his moral character. Some allusion to Seneca's first wife would also have been natural, as being, presumably, in Mr. Holland's opinion, the mother of 'Marcus,' the *blandus puer* of the *Consolatio ad Heluiam*, whom he judges to have been Seneca's son. We are indeed on p. 111 introduced to Seneca's 'young wife Paullina,' who is described four pages later as 'his second wife'; but in the appendix of genealogical tables, imperial and Senecan, it is not clear which of Seneca's wives is regarded as the mother of 'Marcus.' The fact should be added that the *Consolatio ad Heluiam* proves Seneca to have already lost a boy by death. As to 'Marcus,' it ought to be pointed out that Mr. J. D. Duff, in his edition of Seneca's *Dialogues* X., XI., XII., has advocated his identification with Lucan by arguments not easily assailed. Concerning the elder Seneca's birth-year, Mr. Holland does not mention the commonly accepted date of 55 or 54 B.C., but on p. 5, apropos of Seneca's regret that he had not come to Rome soon enough to hear the living voice of Cicero, he selects as a *terminus a quo* the year 46 B.C., and argues: 'If M. Seneca was 15 or 16 years of age at the time, he would have been born about the year 61 B.C.' The arithmetic is infallible, but the premises

of the contention are arbitrary, and, as the elder Seneca died between 37 and 41 A.D. (probably in 39 A.D.), the date 61 B.C. seems mainly to have the merit of making him possibly a centenarian when he died. The identification of Seneca's aunt with the widow of a governor of Egypt, Vitrasius Pollio (Mr. Holland assumes the identification and calls him Vetrasius, p. 21), though it comes down with the authority of Lipsius, has been doubted; the difficulties in the matter and the arguments for C. Galerius are discussed by M. Favez in his edition of the *Consolatio ad Heluiam*.

Mr. Holland's attitude on certain literary questions invites comment. He accepts (p. 129) as 'almost established'—though in this case he recognises that the authorship has been impugned—the ascription of the poem on *Aetna* to Lucilius, the friend to whom Seneca addressed his *Letters* and certain other works. As regards the tragedies assigned to Seneca, he will find it a hard task to convince many critics of the theory which he adopts that they were, as well as the *Octavia*, apparently composed by another author of the same name. He lays stress on Quintilian's omission of Seneca from his enumeration of Roman writers of tragedy, arguing that this is comprehensible if the plays were by some Seneca who was alive when Quintilian wrote, it being Quintilian's usage not to mention living contemporaries. But apart from the internal evidence of style in support of Senecan authorship for at any rate most of the plays, it does not seem a likely hypothesis that Quintilian's quotation (IX. 2, 8) from *Medea apud Senecam* should refer to any other than the well-known Seneca whom he criticises so notoriously elsewhere.

On the treatise *Ad Polybium* the surprisingly guarded remark is made (p. 39) that it 'is supposed to have been written by him from his place of exile.' The reason for this cautious statement appears when Mr. Holland propounds, without venturing to approve, Diderot's totally incredible theory that the *Ad Polybium* was forged. On the contrary, it bears the unmistakeable stamp of Seneca's style even in its ingenious

artificiality and far-fetched adulation; and Mr. Holland is much too sweeping in his pronouncement that 'there is hardly a sentence in it worthy of quotation.' Several could easily be found like *magna seruitus est magna fortuna* and *omnis uita supplicium est*, followed by the fine passage on the perilous voyage across the ocean of life to the one haven of death.

When Mr. Holland puts forward on p. 12 an analogy between the position of Quintilian as a critic in Latin literature and that of Sainte-Beuve in French, it is chiefly, as I understand him, because he discerns a parallel between Quintilian's strong preference for Cicero over Seneca and Sainte-Beuve's attitude towards the transition from the French encyclopaedists of the eighteenth century to Chateaubriand and Victor Hugo. But the parallel might mislead. Quintilian was a consistent Ciceronian; Sainte-Beuve, on the other hand, did not keep to one literary camp. Though he quarrelled with Hugo, he had praised him enthusiastically, and he cannot be deprived of his place in the romantic movement of his day. The parallel, if drawn without qualification, appears to ignore the sympathy with romantic ideals which marked the author of *La Vie et Poésie de Joseph Delorme*.

It has struck me as unfortunate that the author of the book loses some of his space through occasional repetition, especially of quotations. We have twice (p. 25 and p. 44) the words of Suetonius on the height of Seneca's popularity *tum maxime placentem*; we are twice told, in both cases in English as well as in Latin (p. 132 and p. 175), about Seneca's doctrine that the pomp and circumstance of things and not the things themselves form the subject of human fear; and we are twice assured (p. 77 and p. 171) that according to the elder Pliny no man was

less beguiled than Seneca by the appearance of things—*minime mirator inanium*. In each case it would have been more valuable to meet with new points, such as Mr. Holland's enthusiasm for Seneca might well provide.

To an apologia for Seneca's riches Mr. Holland addresses himself very properly in one of his chapters. The ancient and often repeated charges brought against him as a sham Stoic who preached austerity to others while he amassed wealth himself are well dealt with. The real answer, it seems to me, must always be drawn from what the author calls 'the genuine humility of the man.' Seneca does not pose as a perfect sage or saint, though his censors' arguments almost assume that. On the contrary, he explicitly disclaims the title to be ideally virtuous, and avows his human weakness. He is, besides, practical enough to defend the use, though not the abuse, of wealth. In a chapter of 22 pages a summary is given of the outstanding tenets of Seneca's philosophy; but this is subordinate to the biographical interest of the work. With the remarks on Seneca as a dualist (p. 167) it would have been instructive to couple a clear statement of the relation which his dualism bears to the logical implications of the strict and primitive Stoicism; and the claim advanced on p. 176 that 'Seneca supplied the clutch to Stoicism by applying it to the practical conduct of life' should be modified by the reminder that the Stoic philosophy was a practical system much earlier than in his times.

'To fill the page,' as he says, Mr. Holland has added a readable paper on Caius Maecenas, republished from the *Dublin Review*.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

*Arms'ong College,
In the University of Durham,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.*

MARTIAL: EPIGRAMS.

Martial: Epigrams. With an English Translation. By WALTER C. A. KER, M.A., sometime Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge; of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Vol. I. (to end of Book VII.). 8vo. Pp. xxii + 492. London: Wm. Heinemann. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1919. 7s. 6d. net.

THE first volume of the Loeb Martial contains, in addition to an introduction and bibliography, the text and translation of the book 'On the Spectacles' and of the first seven books of epigrams. Mr. Ker's brief and interesting Introduction says the right kind of thing to put the reader in touch with the epigrammatist; and it is followed by notes on the MSS., from which one learns that the text used is that of the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* (1905). The bibliography is partly, and very appropriately, devoted to translations, complete or otherwise, from Martial.

All poets are in a sense untranslatable; but a witty poet possesses a double share of untranslatability. How shall the translator decide between the hunt for more or less analogous forms of verse vaguely suggestive of the original and a prose version which shall ensure that all essential points of subject-matter (so varied in Martial) are made clear? The latter is the way to do fuller justice; and it is Mr. Ker's way. He has done his work with care and taste, succeeding all the better in that he explicitly realised the hardness of his task. For some of the peculiar difficulties of translating Martial are touched upon in the introduction—especially two pre-eminent difficulties, the one, that of conveying the sense when a paraphrase rather than a translation would seem necessary to render the subject-matter luminous, and the other, that of representing in anything like comparable degree the terse pith and bite of the Latin. In this connexion a phrase from old Gawain Douglas about 'the mixt and subtill Martial' prompts one at times to hanker after a corresponding variety in any translator—a

range in English probably even from Limericks to blank verse (for Martial can be dignified, beautiful, and even pathetic), a range, that is to say, capable of producing effects such as he attains by his wealth of metrical forms. Prose inevitably loses so much. It does not readily exhibit either the neat ring and sting requisite in the satiric epigrams or enough rhythm and beauty of words suitable for the more poetic pieces. Subject to such reservations in favour of verse, one gladly commends Mr. Ker's achievement in prose.

Naturally there are words or expressions here and there open to criticism; for tastes differ. For example, I do not like 'burgeoning years' for the simple *crescentibus annis* of a young man's life in I. lxxxviii.; and to the English reader *nutantia pondera* in the same poem would be more intelligible as 'tottering weight' than as 'nodding weight.' I do not quite believe in the 'airy gambols of hares' for the *lasciuos leporum cursus* of I. xliv.; and it may be just a little bold to write of the 'chink' (*crepant*) of kisses, I. lxxvi., and may give some a needlessly modern jar to find *ne ualeam*, II. v., rendered 'may I be shot.' But objections on the score of modernity tend to be pressed hypercritically, and no one will censure Mr. Ker's version of the retort to 'AI in cloaks' (*alpha paenulatorum*) in up-to-date war-style as 'B2 in togas' (*beta togatorum*, V. xxvi.). Occasionally a word appears to get less than its full value: e.g., in VII. lxxxiii., regarding the hairdresser, Master Nimble (*Eutrapelus*), who, shave he never so nimbly, finds the beard of Luperus springing up or sprouting again beneath his very razor,

*Eutrapelus tonsor dum circuit ora Luperci
Expingitque genas altera barba subit,*

there seems to be a falling-off in force when *subit* (retaining, as usual in Martial, the point to the end) is rendered merely 'grows' in 'While Eutrapelus the barber goes round Luperus' face and trims his cheeks, a second beard grows'; and for my part

I should get more of Martial's effect here from flippant lines like

There once was a barber called Smart,
Who plied his tonsorial art
Round Lupercus's face,
But in spite of his pace
A new beard kept trying to start.

In IV. xlv. 6 *numine* is accepted in the text, but *nomine* is translated; and in I. cxv.,

*loto candidior puella cycno
argento niue lilio ligistro,*

while I agree that *loto*, and not *toto*, should be read, I wonder whether Martial actually intended to picture 'a girl whiter than a washed swan' with a hyperbolic suggestion like that implied in the 'hoary-white swans' (*senibus cycnis*) of V. xxxvii. I suspect that this too much resembles the proverbially unnecessary process of 'painting the lily,' and should in fact argue that he may have simply meant to refer to the Nile lotus of the white-flowered variety. If so, *loto* is not an epithet, but the first item in a list of objects with which the blonde damsel is compared:

A maid than lotus whiter or the swan,
Than silver, lily, snow or privet-flower.

Error easily creeps into the numbering of references and cross-references in an author like Martial, and the few oversights which I have noted might be corrected in a second edition or in an inserted slip containing *errata*. In Introd. p. xii., footnote, IV. xxiv. should be read for IV. xxiii.; p. xiv., footnote, IV. xlix. for IV. xlviii., which is indecent; and p. 141, footnote, I. ciii. for I. civ. In the text of VI. xliii. 6 *hoc sunt mihi uestrae* is an obviously distorted half-pentameter, and in the translation of VII. xxvii. 5 'with' has dropped out of 'grow fat the steaming reek.' II. xiv. 6 has *Phillyrides* against *Philyrides* in the footnote; and IV. ix. 2 *Clytium* in the Latin against *Clitus* in the English. At I. lxi. 3 'apprised' is

presumably intended to be 'appraised' as a translation of *censetur*, and at IV. viii. 3 'tastes' must, I imagine, be a misprint for 'tasks,' to represent *labores*.

I venture to submit that it is awkward and sometimes a little confusing to have both the textual notes and those on subject-matter numbered on the same system, with the result that one may find three occurrences of the same reference-figure on the same page, e.g. p. 42 and p. 78.

One or two matters of fact call for comment. It is misleading to call A.D. 63 or 64 'the last days of Nero' (Introd., p. viii); unfortunately the tyrant had still before him several years in which to work mischief. In footnote, p. 257, 'Annaeus Pomponius Mela' is reckoned a member of the Seneca family, and is further described in error as 'the writer on geography.' This is a serious confusion between Annaeus Mela, who was Seneca's brother, and Pomponius Mela, the geographer. On p. 267, if *Arpi* of IV. lv. is an allusion to Cicero's birthplace, as the footnote says, it would be well to add that Martial has substituted it for *Arpinum*; just as on p. 319, where 'for your Calabrian lyre' is explained as 'for lyrics like Horace's,' it would be desirable to mention that 'Calabrian' is inaccurate in view of Horace's familiar doubt as to whether he himself was Lucanian or Apulian.

Mr. Ker has shown skill in translating the maximum possible of a writer who can be ineffably coarse: sometimes toning down, sometimes resorting to discreet dashes, sometimes cloaking the Latin in the half-disguise of Graglia's Italian, he has contrived to avoid too many yawning gaps. The notes are kept excellently within due compass and are always to the point.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
In the University of Durham,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

AN ECONOMIC HISTORY OF ROME TO THE END OF THE REPUBLIC.

An Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic. TENNEY FRANK. Pp. xi+310. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1920. \$2.50.

GOOD and interesting as this book is, it does not completely satisfy the expectations excited by its title. Professor Frank promises us an economic history; he gives us in fact sketches of some economic questions and difficulties raised by the earlier history of Rome, and a more complete picture of the economic condition of Italy in the last age of the Republic and the first of the Empire. Both sketches and picture are admirably done and in many parts original, so that the book is well worth reading, even if it falls short of being a history in the full sense of the word. Further, the author, as he himself suggests in the Preface, could hardly do more, at least in the earlier part of his work, for lack of material. The history of Rome was written by men who cared little or nothing for trade and industry, and therefore naturally contains but few and casual remarks on economic conditions. Archaeology, unsupported by written evidence, speaks with but an uncertain voice. Thus we may accept the suggestive sketches of early agriculture and trade as all that is possible under the circumstances, though even here we wish that Professor Frank had given in detail his arguments for his interesting and novel theory that Rome consistently aimed at a bimetallic system. The laudable determination not to repeat himself has led here and elsewhere (*cf.* pp. 84 and 108) to some little incompleteness.

But in dealing with later ages a more determined attempt should have been made to distinguish different periods. A picture of industry and commerce at the end of the Republic, for which the evidence is drawn freely from the Digest (p. 246) and from inscriptions of the imperial age (*passim*), does not inspire us with absolute confidence. Again, the account of farming under the later Republic is wanting in historical

perspective. Cato, Varro, and Columella are all put together under the plantation system, and the changes traceable in the course of three centuries are virtually ignored. Yet surely it is not fanciful to see in Cato's absorption in the cultivation of the vine and olive the first great change from the corn-growing of the yeomen, and to regard Varro's insistence on stock-feeding (*pastio*), both on a large scale (*pecuaria*), and also round the homestead (*villatica*), as a further stage of development. Varro himself (*R.R.* III. 1, 8) asserts that he is the first writer to treat the latter branch of stock-farming separately, and his remarks, especially those on peacocks and fish-ponds, reflect the new luxury of the age of Lucullus. Columella really falls outside the period, but we may justly see in the barracoons (*ergastula*) described by him an extreme development of the system of slavery assumed by Cato and Varro, and in his guarded recommendation of free tenants (*coloni*) a healthy reaction.

One or two other points are also open to criticism. In speaking of Cato's order of preference, Professor Frank (p. 97, *n.*) suggests that Pliny's statement that Cato advocated cattle-raising above all may come from a lost volume on farming in Latium. If that were so, it is unlikely that Varro (*R.R.* I. 7, 9) would have failed to notice the fact. But Pliny's statement is merely an abbreviation of the anecdote given in full by Cicero (*de Off.* II. 25, 89), which refers to a conversation and not to a written work. Again the assertion (p. 161) 'that slaves usually married and had goodly families' is based on insufficient evidence. The fact that favoured slaves in aristocratic families married and had children (p. 160) proves little for the great majority of urban households, and for country slaves the evidence is rather conflicting. The stress laid on the position of slaves born in the house (*vernae*) goes to show that they were the exception, not the rule; again Cato seems to assume that only one woman, the *villica*, will be employed on his model farm, and even Varro distinctly regards marriage

as a privilege to be granted to special classes of slaves, such as the overseers and shepherds (*R.R.* I. 17, 5; II. 1, 26, and 10, 6; I correct the author's references where necessary). The sweeping generalisation in Appian (I. 7) may well be an erroneous inference from the multitude of *imported* slaves mentioned by Plutarch in a parallel passage (*T. Gracch.* 8). On this question confident dogmatism is out of place; our statements must be guarded and cautious.

But enough of such minor criticisms. In conclusion I should like to congratulate Professor Frank on having broken new ground in this stimulating and suggestive work, and may perhaps be allowed to express a hope that his other duties will not finally prevent him from continuing his history through the Empire.

W. W. How.

*Merton College,
Oxford.*

SHORT NOTICES

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Part XIV. Edited, with Translations and Notes, by B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. With three plates. Egypt Exploration Society. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co. 1920.

THIS volume of the ever welcome series contains no literary papyri, but official and business documents and private letters, ranging from the second century B.C. to the fourth century after. The three plates contain specimens of writing from B.C. 73, 63, 44, and thereabouts, which are not common.

There are many novelties of various kinds in the documents. Thus the *μειζων* as a village official appears for the first time (1626), A.D. 325, and there are a few new titles, such as *ὑπογεωργός* and *ὁ πρὸς παραδοχῇ*; 1627 gives some light on the liturgies; 1632 on the chronological eras (fully discussed on p. 27); 1659 has new information on the position of the nomes. There is bidding (*αἴρεσις*) for a lease, with some peculiar attendant circumstances (1630 and elsewhere); and 1631 for the first time describes a contract for labour, with minute information as to the processes of vine cultivation, the making of wine, and care of land. This last also contains some new words, as *κομπασία*, the 'ringing' of jars to see if they are sound; and it is interesting to note *βοτανισμός* for weeding, and *ἀκρόδρνα* for fruit-trees. Banking, the division of an inheritance, the appointment of legal representatives, are other subjects

illustrated (1639, 1637-8, 1642-3, 1662). Lists of domestic articles and the contents of a soldier's knapsack (1645, 1657); abstracts of contracts from the *βιβλιοθήκη δημοσίων λόγων* (1648-9); recruiting methods (1666): are worth notice.

A deed of apprenticeship to a weaver would hardly satisfy our trades unions; the apprentice gets eighteen days a year for holiday, and works from sunrise to sunset. The letters contain less human interest than usual; but it is surely remarkable that a son wishes to stamp a mark on his father's body, in case he should be killed on a journey (1680). Another, No. 1683, contains a sentence which deserves attention. Probus had asked his sister Manatine to let him have some money to buy a kettle, and she said (I quote the translation): 'Use your own, and presently I will give it to you.' The words are: *ἄρων* (*sic*) *τὰ ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ ἄρτι δέ σε δίδω*. It is an illiterate letter, and *καὶ . . . δέ* seems an unlikely group of particles; but if *δέ* could be the negative (Mod. Greek *δέν* or *δέ*) it would yield a more natural rendering, 'and now I will not give you any.' No example of the negative *δέ(ν)* is known, I believe, for centuries after this date (about 400), but it might be worth while to bear the possibility in mind.

A catalogue of minor documents abbreviated (1685-1777) completes the book.

W. H. D. R.

Euclid in Greek: Book I. With Introduction and Notes by Sir THOMAS L. HEATH. Cambridge University Press. 10s.

I DO not know whether anyone else has tried Euclid in Greek with a school class, but I have often, and this gives a special interest to the present book for me. It is not quite the same thing now that we have only a desiccated Euclid in school, as it used to be when his excellent logic had to be learnt thoroughly: but even so, Euclid in Greek is a pleasant novelty, with a few propositions done *viva voce*. Anyone who wishes to try it will find Sir Thomas Heath's book an instructive companion. He gives a succinct account of Euclid's works in the preface, of his followers and commentators, of the fate of the *Elements* in the Middle Ages, the early editions and translations. The notes are admirable. They contain, it is true, a good deal of elementary Greek for the weaker vessels; but they also deal with the philosophy of the work and its foundations in a way which will be found valuable by many thoughtful men.

No one need be surprised to find that Sir Thomas Heath, in spite of Oxford and Cambridge and all the barbaric forces of the day, still holds that 'the study of Greek will be no whit less necessary to a complete education.' The few educated men of science always hold this view: unfortunately, their numbers will be smaller in the future than they were in the past.

Euclid would have had sympathy with the harassed schoolmaster, who is always being attacked by parents about their sons' 'future careers.' His effective snub to one such man is recited in the preface, and is alone worth the price of the book.

W. H. D. R.

Aristophanes and the War Party. By Professor GILBERT MURRAY. Pp. 48. Allen and Unwin. Paper, 1s. net; cloth, 2s. net.

Two years have gone by since this address was delivered as the Creighton lecture, and the conditions of our own country seem, unhappily, to approach even nearer than they did in 1918 to the sombre analysis which it contains

of the condition of Athens during the latter part of the Peloponnesian War. As the sub-title ('A Study in the Contemporary Criticism of the Peloponnesian War') implies, the brochure is a real contribution to the interpretation of ancient literature, and brings out very sanely the serious sense that lies behind the buffoonery of Aristophanes. The peroration is in the true spirit of idealism, and should be read daily by every Cabinet Minister and Government official. Let scholars at any rate read it, and trust that its spirit will permeate through them to those who control our political destinies.

R. B. A.

Études sur la Signification et la Place de la Physique dans la Philosophie de Platon. Par LÉON ROBIN. One volume. 8vo. Pp. 96. Paris: Félix Alcan, 1919.

THIS 'Study' of Plato's *Physics* is concerned mainly, as might be anticipated, with the *Timaeus*. The author has already investigated the Aristotelian evidence for Platonic theory in an elaborate book (with which I must confess I am unacquainted) entitled *La Théorie platonicienne des Idées et des Nombres d'après Aristote*, and the views there arrived at are here applied to elucidate the significance of the physics of the *Timaeus*. To determine as precisely as possible the relation in which that 'mechanistic' physics stands to the teleological idealism maintained side by side with it in the same dialogue is the problem to which M. Robin addresses himself. This peculiar association of idealism and mechanism cannot be explained, as he maintains, if we leave out of sight the doctrine of Ideal Numbers and Ideal Figures—i.e., of means between the One and the Infinite, corresponding to the mathematical numbers and figures which mediate between Ideas and things sensible. This doctrine establishes 'une hiérarchie de l'être,' which descends from the One, first through all the grades of the intelligible world (viz., Ideal Numbers, Ideal Figures, and Ideas which are 'essences qualitatives')—a world whose 'matter' is indivisible extension—and next through the world of sense, modelled on the ideal world, but char-

acterised by a different 'modality of existence,' as the sphere of divisible space-extension. The unifying principle, the link between the two worlds, is the Soul — 'et la mathématique de l'âme est ce qui lie l'une à l'autre ces deux modalités de l'existence, ce qui permet à la seconde de participer à l'intelligibilité de la première.' Moreover, since the sense-world is a copy of the thought-world, the flux of the sense-world implies an 'infinite mobility' in the (extended but indivisible) matter of the thought-world. 'L'univers intelligible est mouvement, vie et pensée, et c'est, je le crains, une faute de voir (comme parait le faire M. Bergson dans le dernier chapitre de *L'Evolution créatrice*) dans l'idéalisme platonicien une sorte de logique transcendante et d'ontologie statique.' M. Robin concludes with the observation that 'ce n'est pas autant chez Kant, comme on l'a cru, que se retrouverait le mieux l'esprit de la philosophie platonicienne. Ce serait plutôt chez Descartes . . . chez Leibniz . . . mais sans doute surtout chez Malebranche.' Besides the general exposition—marked by the wonted lucidity of French scholars—there are a number of footnotes dealing with special difficulties: many of these have reference to interpretations of passages in the *Timaeus* by the English editor, the late Mr. Archer-Hind; and there are several allusions also to views of Mr. John Burnet; other notes of interest deal with points in the *Philebus*—e.g., the question as to how an Idea can be μικτόν. Altogether, this 'Study' shows both ability and acumen, but it is so largely dependent upon the earlier volume that its separate value is not easy to estimate. Just one peculiar interpretation may be noted: in *Tim.* 52c. (ἐτέρον δὲ τινος αἰὲ φέρεται φάντασμα) M. Robin, taking αἰὲ with τινος, renders 'une apparence mobile de quelque chose d'éternel!' R. G. BURY.

Literary Recreations and More Literary Recreations. By Sir EDWARD COOK. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. net each.

In his preface to the second of these volumes, Sir Edward Cook thus

modestly avows his object in writing them: 'As these essays are written by one whose scholarship is rusty and are addressed to "the general reader," they may perhaps serve to illustrate the interest which is to be found in the ancient classics, even at second-hand, and the relation which should exist between the study of English and of classical literature.' They may safely be recommended, especially to those whose scholarship is not rusty, as an antidote to the spirit of 'specialised,' or narrow, scholarship to which classical studies are peculiarly liable to lead in the case of those who pay more attention to the letter than to the spirit of the ancient writers. That this should be so is something of a paradox and—in so far as it is true—a condemnation of classical scholarship, for the ancient writers were the most humane of men, and their works form the *Literae Humaniores* of modern life, but the average classical 'commentary' is only too glaring an illustration of the truth of the paradox. Sir Edward Cook is far too polite to dwell upon the point, but we may take to heart his reminder of Addison's burlesque of an annotated classic (*Spectator*, No. 470) followed, as it is, by a comparison between Shelley's and Jebb's comment upon a line in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, which is greatly to the advantage of the former (Vol. II., p. 155). In the same connexion he reminds us of Boyle's dismissal of the art of emendation as 'next after anagrams and acrostics the lowest diversion a man can betake himself to' (Vol. I., p. 247). We may all profit by the mellow spirit of this 'rusty' scholarship.

The second of the two volumes will chiefly interest readers of the *Classical Review*, as it deals very largely with classical subjects—*The Classics in Daily Life*, *A Ramble in Pliny's Letters*, *The Charm of the Greek Anthology*, etc.—but both of them show us a man who habitually found literature a great 'recreation' of the spirit. Sir Edward Cook does not refer to Cicero's splendid panegyric of literature in the *Pro Archia*, but he could have found no better words than the following in which to describe his whole attitude to literature, both ancient and modern: 'nam ceterae

neque temporum sunt neque aetatum omnium neque locorum; at haec studia adulescentiam acuunt, senectutem oblectant, secundas res ornant, adversis perfugium ac solacium praebent, delectant domi, non impediunt foris, pernoctant nobiscum, peregrinantur, rusticantur.' All of the essays are rather graceful and charming than remarkable for any great profundity of thought, but as the author himself says, in connexion with a comparison of the letters of Pliny with those of Cicero—'there is nothing very fruitful in the kind of criticism which asks of a comedy why it was not a tragedy' (II. 97), and the essays will give pleasure to the scholar's leisure hour, greater, perhaps, for their occasional illuminations—such as the comparison of Turner's painting with Shelley's poetry (I. 220)—than would have been produced by a steadier and more constant glow of thought.

R. B. APPLETON.

Epicuro: Opere, frammenti, testimonianze sulla sua vita. Tradotti con introduzione e commento da ETTORE BIGNONE. One volume. 8vo. Pp. x + 272. Bari: Laterza e figli, 1920. L. 15.50.

This translation of the literary remains of Epicurus deserves the special attention of all students of later Greek and Graeco-Roman philosophy, if only because of the fact that the author has

spared no pains in making it as complete as possible. It is a pity that he has not supplied a text along with the translation, but it is a satisfaction to learn that he hopes in good time to publish a complete text. Meanwhile, the frequent references to the standard text of Usener (*Epicurea*) in M. Bignone's footnotes, and the care with which he indicates the places in which he diverges from, or supplements, Usener enable the reader to jog along, however tediously. The 'Introduction' deals mainly with literary questions, such as the authenticity and arrangement of the *κύρια δόξαι*. The 'Works' are taken in the order—*ad Menoeceum*, *κύρια δόξαι*, *ad Herodotum*, *ad Pythoclem*; the 'Fragments' include (besides those in Usener's collection) the 81 *δόξαι* ('Sentenze Vaticane') which Wotke discovered and published in 1888, the year after Usener's book appeared. The volume concludes with an Appendix in five sections, and an 'Indice' which is merely a 'table of contents.' The questions dealt with in the Appendix mainly concern the *Ep. ad Herod.* The book contains many points of interest for the textual critic since M. Bignone frequently rejects Usener's readings, sometimes in favour of the traditional text. But it will be easier to estimate the value of his critical work when he gives us a printed text of his own.

R. G. BURY.

NOTES AND NEWS

THE first number of the *Review* for 1921 will be published in February. Articles on the practical teaching of classics have been promised by Mr. J. G. Legge, Director of Education in Liverpool, and Dr. J. W. Mackail. Readers are requested to assist the Journals Board and the editors by finding additional subscribers, and also by sending to the editors suggestions for increasing the utility of the *Review*. General correspondence and all original contributions should in future be sent to Mr. J. T. Sheppard, King's College, Cambridge; reviews of books and correspondence relating to book notices

should be sent to Mr. R. W. Livingstone, Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

The *Agamemnon* and the *Choephorae* are to be presented in an English version on November 26 and 27 by members of the University of Aberdeen. This is the second Aberdeen Greek play, and we hope to hear that it has been no less successful than was the performance of the *Antigone* in Professor's Harrower's version last year. The music for the *Choephorae* is being composed by Mr. R. Whittaker, of Newcastle.

At Cambridge during the week March 2-9, 1921, there will be performances in Greek of the Oresteian Trilogy. An acting edition has been prepared and will shortly be issued by Messrs. Bowes and Bowes. This book, which is being printed by the University Press, will contain a new verse translation of the three plays, as abridged for this performance, specially written by Mr. R. C. Trevelyan, who is a poet as well as a scholar, and whose translations of the *Ajax* and of *Lucretius* are known to readers of the *Review*. The

Greek text is to be edited by Mr. J. T. Sheppard, who, with the assistance of Mr. Burnaby (the Creon of the last Greek play, the *Oedipus Tyrannus*), will be in charge of the production. New music has been composed for the Trilogy by Mr. Armstrong Gibbs, who is already known to Cambridge players for his admirable incidental music to Webster's *White Devil*, and to a wider audience for his songs and chamber music. The vocal score, with Greek and English words, will be published by Messrs. Goodwin and Tabb.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIRs,—Annotation on Hor. *Odes* B, I, stanza 1. Concerning the comments on the above ode in recent issues of the *Classical Review*, permit me, if it is not too late, to make the following observations:

1. On 'fortiter.'—All sea-captains know by experience that to take a troublesome harbour or berth in bad weather, even in familiar waters, requires quite as much courage as facing a storm in the open sea, not merely in modern times but in earlier—even more so, especially in the latter case. One often wonders how they managed at all with the old broad prowed vessels with their clumsy hand steering gear!

2. 'Fluctus' does not mean 'wind-storms,' but 'waves' or 'floods'; and 'novi fluctus' is far likelier to refer to uneven commotions of the sea, arising from earthquakes underneath, than to unusual winds about the entrance to the harbours. This interpretation compares well with Hor. *Odes* I. 2. Stanza 4, etc. is more in keeping with Horace's presentations of nature in relation to moral laws, with the religion

of the times, and the decadent morals of Augustus's age.

D(AVID) W. R. F. CAMPBELL.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

THERE is a small point in which Mr. T. L. Agar hardly seems fair to the 'Hymns' of Allen and Sikes. I mean the passage where he writes (*Class. Rev.* XXXI. No. 2, 40): *ἥντε μαινὰς*, not as Allen and Sikes say, 'like a mad woman,' but 'like a Maenad.' The note in the edition criticised recognises the possibility of an alternative meaning, but no one would gather this from the review. Moreover, twenty years ago Mr. Walter Leaf expressed the contrary view in his notes on *μαινάδι ἰσθ.* II. XXII. 460, and *μαινόμενῃ εἰκυῖα*, II. VI. 389. Mr. Leaf's authority, of course, is no greater than that of any other scholar of equal acuteness, but his name is not even mentioned. But for all that I feel Mr. Agar is right even if not ideally judicial.

Yours obediently,

A. J. HUGHES.

3, Malta Street, E.C. 1.
August, 1920.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

. Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Autran (C.) 'Phéniciens': Essai de contribution à l'histoire antique de la Méditerranée. 13" x 10". Pp. xvi + 148. Paris: P. Geuthner, 13, Rue Jacob, 1920. 30 frs.

Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres. Extrait du No. 5, 1919. 9 3/4" x 6 1/4". Pp. 305-320.—Extrait des Bulletins de la Classe des Lettres. 9 3/4" x 6 1/4". Séance du 13 octobre, 1919. Pp. 593-601. Séance du 1^{er} mars, 1920. Pp. 45-66. Brussels: Hayez.

Byrne (A. H.) Titus Pomponius Atticus. 9" x 6". Pp. viii + 103. Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr, 1920.

Carcopino (J.) La Loi de Hiéron et Les Romains. 10" x 6 1/4". Pp. xxi + 307.—Virgile et les Origines d'Ostie. 10" x 6 1/4". Pp. x + 818. Paris: de Boccard, 1919.

Crumph (M. M.) The Growth of the Aeneid. 8" x 5 1/4". Pp. 124. Oxford: Blackwell, 1920. Cloth, 6s. net.

- Duckett* (E. C.) Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid. 9" x 6". Pp. xii + 68. Northampton, Mass : Smith College Classical Studies.
- Ellis* (H. D.) English Verse Translations of Selections from The Odes of Horace, The Epigrams of Martial and other Writers. 8½" x 7". Pp. viii + 72. London : H. D. Ellis, 7, Roland Gardens, S.W. 7, 1920. Paper boards, 5s. net.
- Enlart* (C.) Villes Mortes du Moyen Age. 10" x 6½". Pp. 162. Paris : de Boccard, 1920.
- Flinck* (E.) De Octaviae Praetextae Auctore. Doctor's Dissertation. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 101. Helsingfors : Societas Litteraria Fennica.
- Gayley and Kurtz*. Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism. 7½" x 5½". Pp. ix + 911. London : Ginn, 1920. Cloth.
- Guenoun* (L.) La Cessio Bonorum. 10" x 6½". Pp. 101. Paris : Geuthner, 1920.
- Handbook to the Maude Roll*. 13½" x 8¼". Pp. 46. London : Whitcombe and Tombs, 1920. 2s. 6d.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. XXX. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 189. Oxford : University Press (for Harvard University Press). 1919. Paper boards, 6s. 6d. net.
- Kreller* (H.) Graeco-Aegyptian Papyri. 9½" x 6½". Pp. xi + 427. Leipzig : Teubner, 1919. M. 24 (9s. 8d.).
- Laing* (G. J.) The Genitive of Value in Latin and other Constructions with Verbs of Rating. 9½" x 6½". Pp. viii + 48. Chicago : University Press, 1920. 8'75.
- Laurent* (J.) L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam. 9" x 6¼". Pp. xii + 398. Paris : de Boccard, 1919.
- Loeb Library*: Martial's Epigrams, Vol. II. (W. C. A. Ker), pp. 568 ; Marcus Cornelius Fronto, Vol. II. (C. R. Haines), pp. 371 ; Seneca, Vol. II. (R. M. Gummere), pp. 480 ; Thucydides, Vol. II. (C. F. Smith), pp. 445 ; Plutarch's Lives, Vol. IX. (B. Perrin), pp. ix + 619. 6¾" x 4¾". London : W. Heinemann, 1920. Cloth, 10s. net. per vol.
- Metz* (C.) Aliso-Solicinium. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 39. Giessen : University Press, 1920.
- Newton* (E.) A Skeleton Latin Grammar. 7½" x 5". Pp. viii + 191. London : Blackie, 1920. Paper boards, 3s. 6d. net.
- Norden* (E.) Die Germanische Urgeschichte in Tacitus Germania. 9½" x 6½". Pp. x + 505. Leipzig : Teubner, 1920. 10s. 6d. Cloth, 13s. 4d.
- Papers of the British School at Athens*. Vol. IX. 10½" x 8". Pp. xiii + 262, and 36 Plates. London : Macmillan. Paper boards, 42s. net.
- Papyrusinstitut Heidelberg: Schrift I*. Vom göttlichen Fluidum nach ägyptischer Anschauung von Professor Dr. F. Preisigke. 9½" x 6". Pp. 63. Berlin : de Gruyter and Co., 1920. (No price given.)
- Pascal* (Carlo). Scritti Varii di letteratura Latina. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 376. Paravia : Torino, etc., 1920.
- Phillpotts* (Bertha S.) The Elder Edda and Ancient Scandinavian Drama. 9" x 6". Pp. 216. Cambridge : University Press, 1920. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Ramsay* (A. B.) Inter Lilia. 7" x 5". Pp. 105. School Edition. Cambridge : University Press, 1920. Limp cloth, 3s. net.
- Reitzenstein* (R.) Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. 8½" x 5½". Pp. viii + 268. Leipzig : Teubner, 1920. 3s. 2d.; cloth, 4s. 3d.
- Roger Bacon*. Works hitherto unpublished. Vol. V. Edited by R. Steele. 9" x 6". Pp. lxiv + 327. Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1920. 28s. net.
- Stebbing* (W.) Some Masterpieces of Latin Poetry. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 223. London : Fisher Unwin, 1920. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Summers* (W. C.) The Silver Age of Latin Literature. 7½" x 5½". Pp. xii + 323. London : Methuen, 1920. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Sundwall* (Johannes). Der Ursprung der Kretischen Schrift. Acta Academiae Aboensis humaniora, I. 2. 6½" x 9½". Pp. 26. Åbo, 1920.
- Taylor* (E. H.) and *Black* (J. B.) The Empire's War Memorial and a Project for a British Imperial University of Commerce. 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 56. Edinburgh : Macniven and Wallace, 1920. 2s. 6d.
- The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus*. Edited by H. G. E. White. 8" x 5½". Pp. lxxvi + 48. Cambridge : University Press, 1920. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Toutain*: Les Cultes Païens dans l'Empire romain. Part I., Les Provinces latines. Vol. III. Les Cultes indigènes nationaux et locaux: Afrique du Nord, Pér. Ibérique, Gaule. 6½" x 10". Pp. 472. Paris : Leroux, 1920.
- Transactions of the American Philological Association*. Vol. L. 9½" x 6¼". Pp. 194 + lxii, 40. Cleveland, Ohio.
- Trevelyan* (R. C.) Translations from Lucretius. 7½" x 5". Pp. 114. London : Allen and Unwin, 1920. 3s. net.
- Ultimi Tibulli Dies*: Carmen praemis aureo ornatum in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano. 10" x 6". Amsterdam : Müller, 1920.
- Veith* (G.) Der Feldzug von Dyrhachium zwischen Caesar und Pompejus. 10½" x 6½". Pp. xix + 267. Wien : Seidel and Son, 1920.
- Virgil*: The Sixth Book of the Aeneid, by H. E. Butler, M.A. 5½" x 7¾". Pp. viii + 288. Oxford : Blackwell, 1920. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Welvert* (E.) Le Secret de Barnave. 7½" x 4¾". Pp. ix + 189. Paris : de Boccard, 1920. 3 fr. 50.
- Wiener* (Leo). Tacitus Germania and other forgeries. Contributions towards a history of Arabico-Gothic Culture. Vol. III. 9" x 6". Philadelphia, Pa. : Innes and Sons, 129, N. Twelfth Street, 1920. Cloth.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- ABARIS, 2, 139
 Achilles Tatius, some readings in, 93
acies and arces, 26 ff.
 Acusilaus of Argos, new quotation from, 67b
Aeneid XI. (309) 166
 Aeschylus, *Eumenides* (684), 64
 Aesopus, the actor, 92
 Agricola, when did he become Governor of Britain, 158 ff.
 Alapari, 167
 Allen (L. H.), the ignorance of Antilochus, 6 ff.
 Allen's *Greek Theater of the Fifth Century before Christ*, noticed, 169 ff.
 Allison's *Lucretius on the Nature of Things*, noticed, 118 ff.
 alliteration and assonance in Virgil, 23 f.
 'anaphus', 32
 Anderson (J. G. C.), when did Agricola become governor of Britain, 158 ff.
 Anderson (W. G. F.), 'Plato's definition of Colour' (*C.R.* XXXIV. p. 31), 101
 Antilochus, the ignorance of, 6 ff.
ἀπαρτεῖν, the meaning of, in a Spartan inscription, 98
 Apicius, notes on, 33b
 Appian, *Civil Wars* I. (c. 14), note on, 164
 Appleton (R. B.), the *deus ex machina* in Euripides, 10 ff.
 Euripides, *Heracles* (725), 63
 notice of Sir E. Cook's *Literary Recreations and More Literary Recreations*, 183 f.
 notice of Hackett's *My commonplace Book*, 111b
 notice of Lewis' *Practical Hints on the Teaching of Latin*, 35 ff.
 notice of Sir G. Murray's *Aristophanes and the War Party*, 180
 Aristoxenus, 130b
 Armitage (N. C.), Horace, *Odes* I. (14), 34b f.
 Aristotle's criticism of the *Medea*, 11a, 12
 Astraea, 34a
 Athenaeus, Kaibel's Teubner text of, 152 ff.
 notes on, 153 ff.
 Bacchylides V. (142), 101
 Bailey (C.), notice of Sir Robert Allison's *Lucretius on the Nature of Things*, 118 ff.
 Beardslee's *The Use of Φύσις in Fifth-Century Literature*, noticed, 68
 Beazley's *The Lewes House Collection of Ancient Gems*, noticed, 116 f.
 Bell (H. Idris), Sappho's Nereid Ode, 63
 Bignone's *Epicuro : Opere, frammenti, testimonianze sulla sua vita*, noticed, 186
 Blakeney (E. H.), notice of Livingstone and Freeman's *Caesar's Gallic War* (IV. 20-28, and V.), 47
 BOOKS RECEIVED, 48, 80, 128, 183 f.
 bow, simile of the, 54b n.
 Braunnholtz (G. E. K.), notice of Beardslee's *The Use of Φύσις in Fifth Century Literature*, 68
 notice of Buck's *Studies in Greek Noun-Formation*, 39b
 Brooks (E. J.), Bacchylides V. (142), 101
 Buck's *Studies in Greek Noun-Formation*, noticed, 39 f.
 Burton's *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh*, noticed, 45 f.
 Bury (R. G.), *Plato, Ref.* (421B), 32; *Theaetetus* (188B), 102
 notice of Bignone's *Epicuro*, 182
 notice of *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XXIX, 38 f.
 notice of Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. II., Part I., 46
 notice of Rendel Harris' *Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, 46
 Bury (R. G.), notice of Robin's *Études sur la Signification et la Place de la Physique dans la Philosophie de Platon*, 180
 Butterworth (G. W.), notice of *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 37 f.
 Byrne's *Syntax of High-School Latin*, noticed, 74
 Bywater's *Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England*, noticed, 110
 Cary (M.), note on Appian, *Civil Wars*, I. (c. 14), 164
 Sulla and Cisalpine Gaul, 103
 Caspian, the, in Herodotus, 32
 Casson (S.), the Hyperboreans, 1 ff.
 note on Herodotus IV. (109), 30 f.
 Catullus, XXI. 11, an emendation of, 79b
 Chamaeleon, 130b
 Cholmeley, R. J., obituary notice of, 76
 choregia, date of the, 131b
 Christians, accusations against the Early, 17
 Cicero, some difficulties in the letters of, 21 f.
 Clark (Albert C.), notice of De Groot's *Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm*, 42 ff.
 notice of Freese's *The Octavius of Minucius Felix*, 117 f.
 Clarke (W. K. Lowther), notice of Burton's *Spirit, Soul, and Flesh*, 45 f.
 Clarke's *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, noticed, 125
 Classical Association, meeting of the, 75 f.
 Classical Studies in Honour of Charles Forster Smith, noticed, 69b
 Clodius Aesopus, 93
 Codrus, 49 f.
 Collatia, 28
 Colson (F. H.), a note on an old grammarian, with a correction, 28 f.
 'Communis sensus', 18 ff.
 Cook's (Sir E.), *Literary Recreations and More Literary Recreations*, noticed, 181 f.
 Cornificius as Daphnis?, 49 ff.
 CORRESPONDENCE, 78, 127, 183
 Croton and Sybaris, monetary union of, 90b
 D'Alton's *Horace and his Age*, noticed, 126
 De Groot's *De numero oratorio Latino*, noticed, 42 ff.
 Handbook of Antique Prose Rhythm, noticed, ib.
deus ex machina, the, in Euripides, 10 ff.
 Diogenes Laertius, I. (104), 101
 Donatus, Sergius' commentary on, 28 ff.
 Duff (J. Wight), notice of Freeman's *Latin Poetry : from Catullus to Claudian*, 73
 notice of Holland's *Seneca*, 173 ff.
 notice of Ker's *Martial : Epigrams*, 176
 Edmonds (J. M.), Sappho's Nereid-Ode again, 4 ff.
 Eitrem (S.), Lykos and Chimaireus, 87 ff.
 Eitrem's *Beiträge zur Griechischen Religionsgeschichte*, noticed, 108 ff.
 Ephorus, a new fragment of, 67b
Ἐπιγραμματα, 26b
 epilepsy, ancient cures for, 87
Eth. Nic. IV. 8. 6, some vicissitudes of, 51 ff.
 Euphorbus, 7a
 Euripides, the *deus ex machina* in, 10 ff.
 Heracles (725), 63
 Evelyn-White (C. H.), notice of *Texts for Students : Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4* (S.P.C.K.), 125a
 notice of Weiskotten's *S. Augustini Vita Scripta a Possidio Episcopo*, 71 f.
 Evliya, the traveller, 31a
 Exul, Martial II. xiv. (1), 66
 Farnell's *Value and Methods of Mythologic Study*, noticed, 69b

- Ferguson (A. S.)**, Diogenes Laertius I. (104), 101
Flickinger's *The Greek Theater and its Drama*, noticed, 169 ff.
 flute-players, payment of, 131b
Foucart's *Le Culte des Héros*, noticed, 114 ff.
Frank (Tenney), Cornificius as Daphnis?, 49 ff.
 Ticidas the neoteric poet, 91 ff.
Frank's *Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic*, noticed, 178
Freeman and Lowe's *A Greek Reader for Schools*, noticed, 70
Freeman's *Latin Poetry: from Catullus to Claudian*, noticed, 73
Freese's *The Octavius of Minucius Felix*, noticed, 117 f
Fronto, 14 ff.
Furness (S. M. M.), note on punctuation of Livy XXVII. 167 f.

Gardner (P.), a numismatic note on the Lelantian War, 90
Garrod (H. W.), the Hyporcheme of Pratinas, 129 ff.
Gaselee (S.), Martial IX. (21), 168
 a new word in S. John Damascene, 32a
 Gelonus, 32a
 glosses of Greek phrases in Cicero's letters, 21 f.
 goat and wolf superstitions, 87 ff.
Gomme (A. W.), notes on Thucydides, Book VI., 81 ff.
 grammarian, note on an old, with a correction, 28 f.
Granger (Frank), Miscellanea, 69
 Greek personal names, 40a
Greene's *Plato's View of Poetry*, noticed, 39
Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XIII., noticed, 67; Part XIV., noticed, 179

Hackett's *My Commonplace Book*, noticed, 111 f.
Haines (C. R.), Fronto, 14 ff.
Hancock's *Studies in Stichomythia*, noticed, 69b
Harrison's (Miss), *Aspects, Aorists and the Classical Tripos*, noticed, 113 f.
Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXVIII., noticed, 37 f.; Vol. XXIX., noticed, 38 f.
Headlam (C. E. S.), the art of Virgil's poetry, 23 ff.
Heath's *Euclid in Greek*, Book I., noticed, 180
 Helixioia, 140
 helmet from Pompeii, a, 102b
 Hero and Leander, 164
 Herodotus IV. (109), note on, 30 f.
 Holland's *Seneca*, noticed, 173 ff.
 Homeric Hymns, further notes on the, 99 ff.
Hoppin's *Handbook of Attic Red-figured Vases*, Vol. II., noticed, 125 f.
Horace, notes on, 156
 Odes I. (xiv.) 34b f.; (xxxiv.), 94
Horton-Smith, R. H., obituary notice of, 47
Housman (A. E.), de Nihilo, 161 ff.
 notice of Bywater's *Four Centuries of Greek Learning in England*, 110
 notice of Postgate's *Phaëri Fabulae Aesopiae*, 121 ff.
How (W. W.), notice of Frank's *Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic*, 178
Hunt (A. S.), notice of Walker's *Ichneutae of Sophocles*, 104 ff.
 Hyperboreans, the, 1 ff., 137 ff.
 hyporcheme of Pratinas, the, 129 ff.
 rhythms of, 132b

Jones's *T. Macci Plauti Menaechmi*, noticed, 40 f.
 Juno and the Trojans, reconciliation of, 65 f.
Juvenal X. (78), 33a

Ker's *Martial: Epigrams*, noticed, 176 f.
Keyes' Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire, noticed, 74
Kittredge's *Chaucer's Lollus*, noticed, 37b f.
Knight's *T. Macci Plauti Menaechmi*, noticed, 120 f.
xplous, the meaning of, as a medical term, 64

Laurence's Cicero *Pro Milone* (Bell's One Term Classics), noticed, 70b
 Lelantian War, a numismatic note on the, 90
Lewis' Practical Hints on the Teaching of Latin, noticed, 35 ff.
Lindsay (W. M.), Alapari, 167
 notes on Apicius, 33b
Livingstone and Freeman's *Caesar's Gallic War* (IV. 20-38, and V.), noticed, 47
Livy XXVII., note on punctuation of, 167 f.
Lofberg's *Sycophancy in Athens*, noticed, 69b
Lollius, Chaucer's, 37b f.
Lumb (T. W.), Hero and Leander, 164
 some readings in Achilles Tatius, 93 ff.
 Lykos and Chimaireus, 87 ff.
 lyric contests, at Athens, 131
 Lysias, new fragments of, 67b

M. (J. W.), *Aeneid* XI. (309), 166
Macurdy (Grace H.), the Hyperboreans again, Abaris, and Helixioia, 137 ff.
 the meaning of *ἀφ'αρείν* in a Spartan inscription, 98 f.
 Marcus Aurelius, 17
 Martial II. xiv. (1), 66b
 Massanissa, 55b
McMahon's *On the Second Book of Aristotle's Poetics*, noticed, 37
 Melanippides, 132a
 Miscellanea, 69
 missile weapons, a covenant not to use, 91b
Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Vol. II., Part I, noticed, 46
Mulvaney (C. M.), some vicissitudes of *Eth. Nic.* IV., 8 (6), 51 ff.
Munro on Lucretius I. (422), 18a
Murray's *Aristophanes and the War Party*, noticed, 180

 names, literary camouflage of, 92a
 nihilo, de, 161 ff.
 NOTES, 30 ff., 63 ff., 98 ff., 104 ff.
 NOTES AND NEWS, 77 f., 127, 182
 notes and suggestions, 152 ff.

 OBITUARY:
 R. H. Horton-Smith, 47
 Roger James Cholmeley, 76
 Octavian, voyages of, 65
 orientation of the dead in Greece and Italy, 141 ff.
 ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS, 1 ff., 49 ff., 81 ff., 129 ff.
 Ovid, *Metamorphosis*, some passages from, 95 ff.

 Panaetius, 52
Pantini (W. E. P.), notice of Byrne's *Syntax of High-School Latin*, 74
 Papias, the *Logia* of, 46
 Pater's *Marius the Epicurian*, 14
Paton (W. R.), Polybiana, 54 ff.
Pearson (A. C.), Sophoclea, 56
Phillimore (J. S.), Terentiana (continued), 57 ff., 147 ff.
 Phrynicius, 134a
 Pindar, some emendations of, 85 ff.
 new fragments of, 67
Plato, *Rep.* (421B), 32
 Theaetetus (188B), 63, 102
 Plato's definition of colour, note on, 31b, 101
Plautus, *Pseudolus*, 157b
 Polybiana, 54 ff.
 Possidius, 72
 Pratinas, the hyporcheme of, 129 ff.
 Proitides, the malady of the, 87
 Prometheus, 88b

Rackham (H.), Greek elegiac version of 'To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,' 127
Raphael (Cedric M.), Aeschylus, *Eumenides* (684), 64

- Rendel Harris' *Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, noticed, 46
Origin and Meaning of Apple-Cults, noticed, 172 f.
 REVIEWS, 35 ff., 67 ff., 104 ff., 164 ff.
 Rhys Roberts' *Greek Civilisation as a Study for the People*, noticed, 69b
 Richards (G. C.), notice of Allen's *The Greek Theater of the Fifth Century before Christ*, and Flichinger's *The Greek Theater and its Drama*, 169 ff.
 Robin's *Etudes sur la Signification et la Place de la Physique dans la Philosophie de Platon*, noticed, 180
 Robinson's *Joseph Scaliger's Estimates of Latin and Greek Authors*, noticed, 39
 Roman education, 'classical' and 'modern' sides of, 29b
 Rose (H. J.), some difficulties in the letters of Cicero, 21 f.
 the orientation of the dead in Greece and Italy, 141 ff.
 notice of Eitrem's *Beiträge zur Griechischen Religionsgeschichte*, 108 ff.
 notice of Foucart's *Le Culte des Héros*, 114 ff.
 notice of Rendel Harris' *Origin and Meaning of Apple-Cults*, 172 f.
 Rouse (W. H. D.), Plato, *Theaetetus* (188b), 63
 notice of Heath's *Euclid in Greek*, Book I., 180
 notice of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XIII., 67; XIV., 179
 S., some school books, 70 f.
 S. (J. M.), obituary notice of R. J. Cholmeley
 S. John Damascene, a new word in, 32a
 Sappho's Nereid-Ode again, 4 f., 63
 school books, notices of, 70 f.
 seals, of the North Caspian, 32a
 Shackle (R. J.), some emendations of Pindar, 85 ff.
 further notes on the Homeric Hymns, 99 ff.
 SHORT NOTICES, 45 ff., 74 ff., 125 ff., 179 ff.
 Slater (D. A.), Juvenal X. (78) 33a
 some passages from the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, 95 ff.
 Sonnenschein (E. A.), notice of Jones' *T. Macci Plauti Menaechni*, 40 f.
 notice of Knight's *T. Macci Plauti Menaechni*, 120 f.
 notice of Walker's *Ichneutae of Sophocles*, 106 f.
 Sophoclea, 56
 spicifera, 33b f.
 Spring's (Miss) *Exposition in Greek Tragedy*, noticed, 38

- Storr-Best (Lloyd), notice of Miss Harrison's *Aspects, Aorists, and the Classical Tripos*, 113 f.
 Sulla and Cisalpine Gaul, 103
 T., notice of Keyes' *Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire*, 74
 T. (E. M. W.), notice of Hoppin's *Handbook of Attic Red-figured Vases*, Vol. II., 125 f.
 Terentiana (continued from C. R. XXXII., 99 ff.), 57 ff., 147 ff.
 Texts for Students, Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 (S.P.C.K.), noticed, 125a
 Theocritus, new MS. readings of, 67b
 Thomson (H. J.), 'anaphus', 32
 'communis sensus', 18 ff.
 Thucydides, Bk. VI., notes on, 81 ff.
 Tidas the neoteric poet, 91 ff.
 Tigris, the name, 40
 Tucker (T. G.), notes and suggestions, 152 ff.
 Van Buren (A. W.), *acies* and *arces*, 26 ff.
 Virgil, *Aen.* II. (567-588), 102
 Vediovis, 89b
 VERSION, 'To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow', 127
 Vince (J. H.), Horace, *Odes* I. 34 (7), 94
 Virgil, *Aen.* II. (567-588), 102
 the art of his poetry, 23 ff.
 characters in the *Eclogues* of, 49 f.
 Virgo, the constellation, 34
 Walters and Conway's *Ad Limen* (supplement) noticed, 70b
 Weatherhead's *Biennium Latinum*, and *Further Rules for Latin Prose*, noticed, 71
 Weiskotten's *S. Augustini Vita Scripta a Possidio Episcopo*, noticed, 71 f.
 Whatmough (T.), *specifera*, 33b f.
 White and Cary's *Collations of the MSS. of Aristophanes Aves*, noticed, 39a
 Winbolt's *Livy's Veti and the Etruscan Confeieracy* (Bell's One Term Classics), noticed, 70b
 Withington (E.), the meaning of *epitrus* as a medical term, 64
 Witt (Norman W. D.), an interpretation of Horace *Odes* III. (3), 65
 Wright (F. A.), a note on Plato's definition of colour, 31b
 Y, notice of Beazley's *The Lewes House Collection of Ancient Gems*, 116 f.

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

- Achilles Tatius:—
 I. 2 (3), 4 (3), 15 (5), 2. 2 (2), 4 (2), 93a; 2. 10 (3), 5. 22 (3), 25 (8), 6. 9 (3), 19 (4), 22 (1), 7. 3 (1, 7), 9 (13), 10 (3), 93b; 7. 13 (1), 94a
 Aelian:—
 Var. Hist. V. (14), 141b
 Aeschylus:—
 Eumen. (684), 64a
 Anth. Lat. Pars II. Carmina Epigraphica (Buecheler, fasc. I. 24 (=C.I.L. vii. 759), 33b f.
 Apicius:—
 (51, 215, 311), 33b
 Appian:—
 Civil Wars I. (14), 164 f.
 Aquinas:—
 Comm. in Nic. Eth. (Freté et Maré, vol. xxv., p. 246), 54b
 Aristotle:—
 Nic. Eth. IV. 8 (6), 51 ff.
 Poetics (1454b. 1), 11a
 Aspasius:—
 (p. 125, 32, Heylbut), 51b; (p. 125, 34), 53a
 Athenaeus:—
 (237 B-C), 153b; 278 B, 290 B, 304 B, 154a;
 (316 E-F, 320 A), 154b; (321 C, 337 E-F),

- 155a; 463 E, 478 D, 155b; (608 D, coll. 80 D, 188 D), 156a; (617 E), 129
 Bacchylides:—
 V. (142), 101b
 Catullus:—
 XXI. (11), 79b
 Cicero:—
 ad Att. X. 12a, 2 (=12, 5), 21b; XV. 11 (2), 22b, 21 (2) 21a, (25), 22; XVI. 1 (5), 21a
 ad Fam. XII. 17 (2), 50 n., 25 (3), 21
 de Domo (97), 20b
 de Nat. Deor. I., XX. (53), 10b
 de Off. I. (103 sq. coll. *Brutus* 292, Diog. Laert. II. 64)
 de Orat. I (12), 19b; 2 (68), 20b; 3 (195) ib.
 pro Planc. (31, 34), 19a
 Corpus Hippocrat.:—
 Affect. (8), 64b
 Dio Cassius:—
 41 (55), 84a
 Diogenes Laertius:—
 I. (48), 141b; (104), 101b
 Dioscorides:—
 A. P. VII. 707 (3 sq.), 131a

- Euripides:**—
Androm. (1233 sqq.), 12a
Electra (1347 sqq.), 12a
Her. (725), 63b; (830 sqq.), 12
Hipp. (1334 sqq., 1431 sqq.), 11b
- Galen:**—
Crit. Diet. 2-5. 9. 864 κ (9. 864, Kühn), 64b
in *Hipp. Prog.* 3-6. 182 (231), *ib.*
- Hero and Leander:**—
(1 sqq., 30 sq.), 165b; (80 sq., 245 sqq., 256 sq., 284 sq., 325), 166a
- Herodotus:**—
II. (135) 4a; IV. (21, 22, 109), 31
- Homeric Hymns:**—
Apoll. (59), 99b
Dem. (99), 99b f.
Herm. (57), 100b; (106), 100a; (280, 383, 457), 100b
- Horace:**—
A. P. (191), 11, 12
Epod. V. (87 sq.), 156
Odes I. (xiv.), 34b f.; xxxiv. (7), 94; III. xxiii. (17), 157a; (viii.), 65 f.
Sat. I. iii. (66), 21a; (177), 156b; vi. (110 sq.), 157a; x. (18), 92b
- Juvenal:**—
X. (78), 33a
- Licinianus:**—
(ed. Teub., p. 32, V. 14), 103b f.
- Livy:**—
XXVII. xl. (10), 167b f.
- Lucretius:**—
I. (422), 18
- Martial:**—
II. xiv. (1, coll. *Aen.* VIII. 205), 66b; IX. (xxi.), 168b
- Ovid:**—
Met. II. (154), 98b; VII. (115 sq.), 98a; VIII. (117 sqq.), 95 f.; (411 sqq.), 96b f.; XI. (714), 97b
- Parthenius:**—
V. (2, 5), IX. (8), 94a; XIII. (3), XIV. (5), XV., XXII., 94b
- Pindar:**—
Ol. XIV. (15), 85a
Pyth. I. (52), III. (106), XI. (57), 85
- Pindar—continued**
Nem. VII. (33), IX. (25), 86a
Isthm. I. (41), 86a; V. (36), VI. (8, 28), 86b; VII. (13), 78
- Plato:**—
Crat. (425d), 11a
Ion (534c), 133a
Meno (76d), 31b
Rep. (421b), 32a
Theact. (188b), 63b, 102a
- Plautus:**—
Pseud. (402, 423, 519 sqq., Lorenz), 157b
- Plutarch:**—
de Musica (1135c, 1141b), 136b; (1141c-d), 131a
Solon (10), 141b
- Polybius:**—
XX. 12 (1) 54; XXI. 21. 6-7 (Buttner-Wolst=XXXII. 2, Hultsch), 55; XXX. 25. 12 (Buttner-Wolst=XXXI. 3, 11, Hultsch), 55b f.
- Pratinas:**—
Frag. (p. 457, Bergk), 129
- S. John Damascene:**—
(Lequien, Vol. II., p. 863, Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* xcvi. col. 649), 32a
- Sappho:**—
Frag. (Brit. Mus. Pap. 739), 4 ff., 63
Scholast in Rhet. (p. 159, 15 ff. Spengel), 51a; (1128a 16, Susemihl), *ib.*
- Seneca:**—
de Ben. I. (12), 21a
- Sergius:**—
Comment. on Donatus (Keil IV. p. 433), 28
- Sophocles:**—
Ai. (1244), 57b
Ant. (471 sq.), 56b
O. T. (971 sq.), 56a
- Tacitus:**—
Dial. (31), 20a
Thesaurus Ling. Lat.—
Vol. II. (col. 18), 32b
- Thucydides:**—
VI. 23 (1), 81 f.; 24 (3), 82b f.; 34 (7), 83b f.; 40 (1), 84
- Virgil:**—
Aen. II. (567 sqq.), 102b; IV. (1 sq.), 24 f.; VI. (774), 28; VII. (695 sq.), 27; VIII. (205 sq.), 66; X. (309), 166 f.; XI. (309), 166 f.
Ecl. VII. (22), 49b

III.—INDEX VERBORUM

A.—GREEK.

ἀγλαία, 5b	δαῦτε, 5b	ἰσοκίνδυνος, 84a	σάρξ, 45b
ἀφατεῖν, 99	δέ(ν), 179b	κρίσις, 64b	σύμμετρος, 31b
ἀφέτης, <i>ib.</i>	δέμας, 135b	κρόνιοι δαίμονες, 88a	σχήματα, <i>ib.</i>
Βέρμιον ὄρος, 1	θεωρίδες, 56a	κρονοδαίμων, 88b	Τίγρης, Τίγρις, 40b
Βουδῖνοι, 30 f.	θεωρικά, <i>ib.</i>	δψις, 31b	τραγικός, 31b
γέννημα, 56b	θηρία τετραγωνοπρόσωπα, 31a	Περφερέες, 3	φύαις, 58
γεωμόροι, 32b		πνεῦμα, 45b	ψυχή, 45b

B.—LATIN.

acies, 26 f.	belle esse, 22b	hanappus, 32b	Romaniae, 72a, b
acumen, 27a	communis sensus, 18 ff.	imperfertitus, 29a	sensus, 20a, n.
acre ciere viros, 23a	effundere, 33a	impractermissa, 72b	vindex, 13b
arx, 27 f.			
Arx Albana, 27b			

